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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

AN EVALUATION OF A 20-HOUR MANAGEMENT SEMINAR ON INTERNAL ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

A. Importance of Subject

The importance of intra-company management seminars is increasing for a number of reasons. Among these are: the growing complexity of the business organization, ever greater technical specialization, the expanding use of quantitative techniques in decision making, the increasing educational, cultural, and social sophistication of the workforce. Also, the business organization can no longer stand apart from its environment as a purely economic entity. Instead it must, to an ever greater extent, play a citizen's role in the socio-political environment in which it exists. To lead the modern business organization a manager must be skilled in a growing number of non-economic areas. And among the more important of these is the area of interpersonal relationships, which the subject Seminar is designed to treat. Its title, "Seminar in Organizational Relations," was chosen
as a non-threatening way of indicating its subject in the view of the typical production-oriented business manager in the company sponsoring the Seminar.¹

B. Purpose of Thesis

The purpose of this thesis shall be to examine the objectives, content, methodology, and impact of the subject Seminar. Through detailed study, it is hoped to estimate the relative effectiveness of the Seminar components and thus illumine how it may be improved. It may also be possible to do some qualified generalizing regarding the impact of the whole Seminar upon its participants. Further, there may be some carry-over of experience with various Seminar content units and techniques into their application in related management development media. For example, the Seminar's use of attendee oral reports on reference study material is a device that could be applied beneficially in a variety of educational projects for managers.

C. Methodology

The central problem selected for the thesis is the

¹The term "Seminar" as initially capitalized will refer throughout the thesis to the Seminar in Organizational Relations.
nature, impact, and implications for related developmental media of the Seminar. It was determined to fall in the category of descriptive research design.

Included among the major hypotheses to be tested were:

1. That the Seminar provided a worthwhile developmental experience from the perspective of its participants and their work associates.

2. That the subject content and instructional methods of the Seminar were beneficial to participants in their regular work.

3. That the Seminar comprised a developmental medium widely used among leading American companies.

4. That, in general, the Seminar achieved to a reasonable degree the goals established for it.

5. That the substantive and methodological content of the Seminar would have application potential in related media of personnel development.
The approach used was to search out all of the available Seminar materials—including outlines, selection materials, evaluation records, career data for participants, specimen transcripts of Seminar discussions, etc.—to analyze these and arrange them in a sequence and manner designed to make them intelligible, illumine their import, and permit relating them to the similar developmental activities of other organizations.

It was specified that to the extent possible the data would be both specific and factual; but it was recognized that evaluation of such media is necessarily value oriented and subjective to a considerable degree. Evaluative opinion was to be reflected with minimum bias in its condensation and reporting, wherever possible recorded transcripts and other specimen materials of Seminar segments were to be used in an effort to minimize distortions.

It was also part of the research plan to conduct a survey of related developmental seminars provided by a representative sample of the larger and more successful corporations in the United States.

The presentation of findings was to follow a familiar pattern, breaking the thesis content down into
traditional elements in the description of an educative project.

And a final thesis section was to identify conclusions regarding the project which related to the hypotheses earlier established.

NOTE: A review of the literature revealed no article or other material which even approximately paralleled the content of this thesis.
**Glossary**

**Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>behavior of groups</td>
<td>the study of interpersonal relationships within a group as these affect the accomplishment of the group's objectives and of the relationships among groups as these affect the objectives of an organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business ethics</td>
<td>the study of how to establish relative weights for economic and non-economic elements in the operation of a business, especially when these are in conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communications</td>
<td>the process, both verbal and non-verbal, by which two or more persons transmit and receive meaningful signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision making</td>
<td>a process like that of problem solving except that it usually involves courses of action rather than solutions and implies the accountability and authority to see that the course of action decided upon is carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department</td>
<td>a term generally used to designate a staff group with accountability for a function or complex thereof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department head</td>
<td>usually a staff as opposed to a line manager and accountable for one or more specialized functions of the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>division</td>
<td>a major segment of the organization whether defined geographically or functionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive</td>
<td>a manager who is an officer of his company or who reports directly to its head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first-line supervisor</td>
<td>one who is directly responsible for the work of employees who themselves are not responsible for the work of others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>a major segment of the business defined in terms of the service or complex of services it contributes to the operation of the company; e.g., Marketing or Industrial Relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>functional (or staff) specialist</td>
<td>a person, usually professionally trained, who is accountable for a special function or part-function of the company's operation and for whom this accountability outweighs any supervisory responsibilities he may also have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human relations</td>
<td>the process by which people relate to each other individually or in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-company</td>
<td>a term used to indicate that an activity occurs under the direct sponsorship and administration of the company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrated company</td>
<td>one that directly carries on all of the major functions related to accomplishing its organizational objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>line</td>
<td>a term used to designate employees whose primary accountability is for the whole work performance of other employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>live-in</td>
<td>a term used to describe a course or seminar where attendees spend two or more consecutive days and inhabit special lodgings on or near the seminar premises while in attendance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
management development. personnel development limited to managers and prospective managers in its application.

manager. one who is accountable for the successful accomplishment of a significant function or geographic area, or some combination of these elements.

middle manager. a manager who is neither a first- or second-line supervisor nor reports directly to the head of his company.

N/A. a symbol used to indicate a question or survey item does "not apply" to the situation being reported.

organizational relations. a term used to cover all of the human elements in directing the work of others.

organizational theory. a complex of concepts and data having to do with the structural makeup and functioning of groups of people who are serving a significant number of common objectives.

personnel development. a formal process combining selection, education, career counseling, and evaluation designed to aid in maximizing the effectiveness of an organization's human resources.

problem solving. a process involving the gathering of data, analysis and definition, a creative search for solutions, selection of one or more appropriate solutions, testing and application and evaluation.

second-line supervisor. one who has first-line supervisors reporting to him.

seminar. an off-the-job educational course involving active participation of the learners in the learning process.
session  one unit or meeting or class in a series together making up a seminar or course.

staff  a term used to designate employees whose primary accountability is for the accomplishment of a specialized function or part function rather than for the supervision of other employees.
CHAPTER II

OVERVIEW

A. Orientation

To intelligibly present a description of the subject Seminar requires a brief overview of the environment in which it was held. Thus, its objectives and make-up can be related to those of the host organization and the sponsoring department.

The host organization was that of a major, integrated petroleum company with sales in excess of $500 million and a manpower count ranging between 8,000 and 10,000 employees during the period 1962 through 1966, when the six Seminars were held. At the corporate headquarters area, where the Seminar convened, there were three main personnel installations: a home office with about 1,200 persons, a nearby research center with about 350, and a refinery with about 600. Of these, approximately 200 were in the middle management echelons from which the participants were chosen. Thus, the 99 persons who participated in the Seminars represented about 50 per cent of the eligible audience. The middle management echelons, as here
constituted, included second, third, and fourth line supervisors, a second line supervisor being one who has other supervisors reporting to him and a fourth line supervisor being typically a staff department head. Also included in this general, middle management category were various technical specialists with few, if any, line responsibilities but having status commensurate with those of the supervisors who participated.

The host company was considered in the oil industry to be a quite conservative one with modest growth aims, heavy emphasis on product quality, generous employee benefit plans, and a long-standing policy of promotion from within the organization. In mid-1965 it was merged into a larger competitor but has since been operated as a separate division of the surviving corporation. Hence, for the purposes of our study, the merger does not present any insurmountable obstacles.

The sponsoring department for the Seminar was the Management Development Department. Its objectives were to aid executive management in the development of managerial talent within the organization. This included preparation of the corporate succession study, counsel regarding executive placement, career planning, special recruitment in the exceptional instances where managers were brought
in from outside, relations with educational institutions, research in industry practices bearing on personnel development, and the preparation and presentation of intra-company management seminars. The Department\(^1\) also prepared an annual Management Potential Rating\(^2\) which served as a source of candidates for seminars and other developmental activities.

Among the intra-company seminars sponsored by the Management Development Department were ones on labor relations, report writing, reading improvement, public speaking—treating rather narrow and specific managerial skills. The subject Seminar, however, was the only relatively general purpose course conducted during the period between 1962 and 1966. Presented once or twice each year, depending upon need and schedule commitments, it provided each time a 20-hour workshop in eight weekly or bi-weekly sessions for a group of about 20 middle managers and technical specialists.\(^3\) The Seminar was conducted by the

\(^{1}\)The term, "Department" with an initial capital, shall refer throughout the thesis to the Management Development Department.

\(^{2}\)The Potential Rating required each manager to identify and evaluate all subordinates with better than average career potential. He also estimated the echelon levels to which these subordinates were likely to advance.

\(^{3}\)Certain minimal exceptions to this statement will be noted in later, more detailed, sections of the thesis.
manager of the Management Development Department. Its major content emphasis was on three areas: communications, interpersonal relations, and problem solving. Among its major instructional techniques were case study discussion, demonstrations, role playing, attendee reports on reference study material, lectures and quizzes. As a text "The Administrator" case book was used. The typical Seminar group represented a cross-section of the division in which it was held or of the company as a whole. In status of its members the typical group covered about three managerial echelons; in very few instances, however, were a manager and his immediate superior permitted to attend the same Seminar. Attendees evaluated the Seminar in a discussion held in its last session and in two written evaluations at the beginning and end of a 90-day period following their attendance. Spot checks were also made in personal interviews following the Seminar with the participant's peers and superiors.

B. Objectives of the Seminar

In general, the aim of the Seminar was to improve

---

the participant's understanding of the management process and skill in its application, especially in the area of his interpersonal relations. This aim was broken down into the following more specific objectives:

1. To expand the participant's understanding of himself, including similarities and differences between his self-concept and how others perceive him.

2. To increase his understanding of the motivation and behavior of others.

3. To improve his understanding and use of the management process.

4. To increase his communication skills.

5. To improve his skill in exploring and analyzing problems involving people.

6. To improve his decision-making ability.

7. To increase his understanding and skill in interpersonal relations through using the Seminar as a clinical experience in which to experiment—with minimum risks.
and penalties—in relating effectively to others.

8. To increase the knowledge of the participant concerning the operations and personnel of company functions outside his own department.
CHAPTER III

SELECTION OF SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

A. The Selection Process

As indicated in Chapter II, Section A, the Management Development Department conducted annually a Succession Study and a Management Potential Rating for the corporate organization. These studies identified many middle managers and technical specialists who could be considered candidates for the Seminar. Once the Seminar became known to managers generally, they would often designate certain of their subordinates as candidates when contributing data to the two studies. A review of the studies by the Department also turned up persons who, in the Department's judgment, would benefit by attending the Seminar, and their participation was then recommended to their superiors.

In general, the company's officers and major department heads (those having other department heads reporting to them) decided who would participate in the Seminar. The Department, however, frequently exercised the right to refuse or defer enrollment when a particular group
threatened to grow too unwieldy in size (more than 20 participants), when too great a vertical distribution would have occurred, when too narrow a cross-section of the organization might have resulted, or when the enrollment would have placed a man and his immediate superior in the same group.

The mechanical process of building the typical Seminar group began with an announcement letter\(^1\) to company officers and major department heads about 30 days prior to the scheduled beginning of the Seminar. The letter identified eight characteristics of the ideal participant and noted that he should possess at least six of the eight. They were:

1. Proven ability in his type of work.
2. Better than average career potential.
3. Experience in supervision or in a technical specialty.
4. Five years' service with the company.
5. Some university education or its equivalent in self-education.
6. No previous participation in a major external or in-company educational seminar or course (20 hours or more) in the current half year.

\(^1\)A specimen announcement letter appears in Appendix I on p. 87.
7. Status reasonably compatible with that of other attendees.

8. An especially strong personal need that the Seminar may be expected to help satisfy. For example, the need to acquire a better understanding of interpersonal relations upon being promoted to a managerial position.

The next step involved personal interviews by the Department manager with all who received the announcement letter. In these interviews the make-up of the Seminar group was worked out within the parameters already established.

When the group was complete an invitation letter\(^1\) was sent to each candidate. Concurrently his immediate superior also notified him orally of his nomination. Sometimes the candidate declined for personal or work conflict reasons, and a replacement was secured through the described process. Most candidates, however, accepted the invitation.

As in most projects of this kind, certain expedient exceptions occurred in the selection process. In the main, however, the process was as described; the participants selected met the qualifications set for them and

---

\(^1\)The invitation letter usually contained an advance assignment. A specimen invitation letter appears in Appendix I on p. 88.
the resulting Seminar group achieved the desired dimensions of size and of horizontal and vertical distribution.

Every effort was made by the Department to prevent the use of coercion in securing participants; still in an authoritarian environment coercive pressures, real and imagined, tend always to be present. It is estimated that less than 10 per cent of the attendees participated reluctantly. A favorable element in this experience was the circumstance that the Seminar was held in high regard throughout the organization.

B. Organizational Distribution of Attendees

Attendees of the six Seminars were distributed as follows among the various divisions and departments of the company:

- Research: 32
- Marketing: 20
- Accounting: 9
- Refining: 7
- Industrial Relations: 7
- Purchasing: 4
- Engineering: 4
- Treasury: 3
- Patent: 3
- Auditing: 3
- Systems: 2
The apparent over-weighting of Research and Marketing participation occurred as a result of holding two sessions primarily devoted to these divisions of the company. Personnel of the Accounting and Exploration and Producing divisions would have been more numerously represented except for the fact that similar but unreported developmental courses for these two divisions were carried on during the period when the Seminars were being held. In this same period, about 300 supervisory personnel of these two divisions attended somewhat similar courses provided jointly by the Corporate Management Development Department and the staff of the divisions in question. These other courses, however, had significant enough differences from the Seminar to preclude their being combined with the Seminar in the thesis.

C. Career Progress of Attendees

In regard to the subsequent career experience of attendees, the following data is of interest:

1 The reason for the total of 100 here and in Chapter VI, while a total of 99 attendees is used in Chapter VIII in reporting the Survey, is that one attendee was reclassified from observer to active participant.
Have received one or more promotions since Seminar 50
No change in position 22
Have left company¹ 20
Have retired 6
Deceased 2

(Total 100)

The data on subsequent career progress of attendees was not reported in Chapter VII for the reason that in the writer's judgment it is more accurately considered an evaluation of the selection process used in securing attendees than of the impact of the Seminar upon attendees. In the situation being studied, it is also distorted by the effects of the merger of the host company into another oil company. While the merger was an uncommonly orderly one, it was bound to cause many dislocations and to result in reorganizations of various kinds. Still, the Seminar, in view of the data reported, can scarcely be assumed to have had a negative career impact upon attendees.

¹Many who left the company did so at the time of the merger between Union Oil Company of California and The Pure Oil Company.
CHAPTER IV

CURRICULUM

To describe the subject content of the Seminar requires a different set of categories from that typical of the business curriculum in a university. The Seminar was less theory-centered and less concerned with the traditional subject categories. It was also by design kept flexible enough to permit adapting its content to the changing environment of the host company and to the needs of attendees, in both sequence and degree of coverage.

Thus, instead of classifying readily under subject headings such as Personnel Administration, Industrial Relations, Psychology, Sociology, etc., the Seminar content falls more naturally into the following categories:

1. Motivation
2. Interpersonal Relations
3. Communications
4. Authority Relationships
5. Organizational Change
6. Planning and Decision Making
7. Management Policy
Similarly, the definition of each of these subject matter areas requires a somewhat different approach than is customarily used. It must be remembered that the Seminar was a highly participative educational medium. The attendees learned as much from their active involvement in the Seminar's various processes as from the printed or lecture content it contained. Thus, the subject matter categories can most meaningfully be described in terms of the ideas and topics the Seminar was designed to foster, clarify, or emphasize. In the exposition that follows, these will be grouped under the category headings earlier established.

1. Motivation
   a. The nature and value of non-economic incentives
   b. The relative impact of various leader attitudes upon the performance and personal development of subordinates
   c. Competitive elements in motivation
   d. Psychological and sociological elements in motivation
2. Interpersonal Relations
   a. The impact of individual differences
   b. Understanding the concepts of perceptual psychology
   c. Group dynamics

3. Communications
   a. Oral
   b. Written
   c. The concepts of general semantics in a business framework
   d. Listening as a special area of emphasis in communication
   e. The nature of group communications

4. Authority Relationships
   a. Delegation
   b. The problems of intra-group and organizational loyalties
c. Authority as a reciprocal process

5. Organizational Change
   a. Individual and group inertia
   b. The nature and exercise of creativity
   c. The introduction of change

6. Planning and Decision Making
   a. The nature of the processes involved
   b. The relativity of logic
   c. Setting realistic objectives
   d. The non-factual elements in decision making

7. Management Policy
   a. Dealing with bureaucratic elements in business organization
   b. Inconsistencies among policy, procedure, and practice
   c. Ethical problems in business
d. The pros and cons of conformity

e. Earning employee commitment to organizational goals

In general, the subject content of the Seminar clustered largely in or near the areas of management process, communications, and interpersonal relations. As was earlier noted, however, the emphasis upon a particular area varied with the estimated needs of the Seminar group. It should also be noted that much of what was learned in a particular Seminar group depended upon the experience and intellectual mix present in that group. Since the Seminar was heavily discussional and participative in its instructional approach, its members learned quite a good deal from each other.
CHAPTER V

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

A. General Description

In general, the instructional materials of the Seminar consisted of business case studies selected from a case book, from various university collections of case studies, and from the Seminar leader's original collection of cases, plus short articles on various aspects of business management and related subjects selected from a miscellany of published materials and the writings of the Seminar leader. These were supplemented on occasion by lectures on management theory, and by a number of short tests, quizzes, and demonstration materials. Materials found to be effective in use were continued; others were substituted for in succeeding sessions.

B. Case Studies

Among the cases from the case book, the most useful were: "Resettling the Highland Tribes," 

---


2 Ibid., pp. 213-217.

As an example of cases drawn from university collections of business cases, one frequently used was "East-Ohio Communications System."⁵ It was effective in developing insights regarding the management process as a result of presenting a business manager who urged his subordinates to practice permissive leadership, but did his own urging in a most non-permissive manner. Many Seminar participants recognized the contrast between the manager's verbal and non-verbal communicating.

"The Case of the Six Lab Conference Leaders" is indicative of the cases drawn from the original collection of the Seminar leader.⁶ It was based on an actual experience within the host company.

C. Articles

Articles from various published sources were assigned for study outside the Seminar to augment the attendee's knowledge of the subjects treated in the Seminar. One of

¹Ibid., pp. 21-25. ²Ibid., 347-352.
³Ibid., pp. 5-14. ⁴Ibid., pp. 319-23.
⁵Copyright 1955, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
⁶See Appendix II, pp. 98-102.
the most effective of these was "Active Listening," a paper prepared by Rogers and Farson. Derived principally from Rogers' experience in non-directive counseling, it suggests the benefits of actively listening for understanding rather than for criticism or rebuttal of a speaker's message.

One of the articles taken from the writings of the Seminar leader was "The Eddying Concept." Most often the articles were used as a basis for oral reports by the Seminar attendees. The attendee was asked to report what ideas and opinions were suggested to him by the article to be reported upon. When time permitted, the reporter then led a discussion of the article and his report upon it.

D. Lecture Materials

Lectures by the Seminar leader were used to convey understanding of certain elements of management theory, communications, and the behavioral sciences. These were

---

1Carl R. Rogers and R. E. Farson, "Active Listening." Reproduced by special permission, the University of Chicago, Industrial Relations Center.

2See Appendix II, p. 96.
drawn largely from the works of McGregor,\textsuperscript{1} Maslow,\textsuperscript{2} Combs and Snygg,\textsuperscript{3} Hayakawa,\textsuperscript{4} Argyris,\textsuperscript{5} and Roethlisberger.\textsuperscript{6} An essay by the Seminar leader entitled "Theory 'X' + 'Y' = 'R',"\textsuperscript{7} and a Graphic Outline\textsuperscript{8} for a lecturette on some of the concepts of phenomenological psychology indicate the nature of the lecture materials.


\textsuperscript{6} F. J. Roethlisberger, \textit{Management and Morale} (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 19\_).

\textsuperscript{7} See Appendix II, p. 102.

\textsuperscript{8} See Appendix II, p. 107.
E. Tests, Quizes, and Demonstration Materials

As a change of pace and to provide mental stimulation, a number of tests, quizzes, and demonstration materials were introduced at appropriate points throughout the Seminar. One of these that had the added value of underlining the nature and difficulty of critical analysis was the "Uncritical Inference Test."\(^1\)

\(^1\)Copyright 19_, W. V. Haney, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois. See Appendix II, p. 92.
CHAPTER VI

PRESENTATION TECHNIQUES

A. Approach

The order for discussing the presentation or instructional techniques used in the Seminar will follow that established in the Seminar Outline.¹ Since certain specimen materials relate more to subject matter, others to techniques, and one to evaluation done within the Seminar, the references in this chapter will be to Appendices II and III. Nonetheless, the concern here shall be with the explanation of the Seminar's major instructional techniques.

B. Seminar Introductions

Under the "Introductions" heading were handled the introduction of attendees, Seminar objectives,² and an explanation of some of the methods to be used by the Seminar leader.

The attendees introduced themselves to the group by stating their names, positions, experience backgrounds,

¹See Appendix II, Section A, pp. 90-92.
and expectations of the course.

Following a brief exposition of the Seminar's objectives, the Seminar leader, in covering methodology, pointed out that the Seminar was a workshop experience involving a great deal of attendee participation. Group discussion of case studies, issues, and attendee reports was mentioned. It was noted that demonstrations, quizzes, and lectures were also part of the Seminar pattern. The use of subgroup discussion, skits, role playing, and group analysis of the Seminar process itself was alluded to, as well. In general, the intent was to both forewarn and arouse the interest of the attendees.

Beyond identifying component instructional techniques, the Introduction period in the Seminar also served to explain the basic educational assumptions upon which it was based. These took into account the age and experience of the attendees and the desirability of encouraging them to use the Seminar as a relatively risk-free environment in which to experiment with some of the concepts and skills it was designed to teach.¹

Essentially, the approach used was what has been

¹See Appendix III, Section E, pp. 123 through 125, for a more detailed explanation of the Seminar's educational approach presented to attendees.
variously described in the literature of educational methodology as the inquiry method, learning by discovery, or participative instruction. It provided business case studies, problem situations, demonstrations, resource materials, exposition and related media as a basis for experiment and discussion by the Seminar group. The primary role of the Seminar leader was to encourage insightful and wide-ranging discussion of the materials provided.

C. Tests and Quizes

The second instructional technique in the Seminar Outline order is the Test or Quiz. One of these, the Uncritical Inference Test,\(^1 \) was used early in the Seminar to sharpen observation and analytic skills and increase sensitivity to the differences between fact and inference. The test was presented with a minimal introduction. Most attendees scored poorly in it—a score of 40 per cent correct answers being common—and this also helped to establish acceptance of the need for learning.

Other similarly difficult tests and quizzes were used as motivation and change-of-pace throughout the Seminar. These included:

1. A test on U.S.A. geography full of little-

\(^1\)See Appendix II, B, pp. 92-95.
known facts—as, for example, that Purdue University is located in West Lafayette, Indiana.

2. A brainteaser quiz including many deceptive questions.

D. Demonstrations

A number of demonstrations were employed, involving the attendees in dealing with some problem critical to managerial performance. One of these was the Spiral Response Exercise,¹ emphasizing the nature and importance of the listening process. Dr. Carl Rogers of the University of Wisconsin has developed a widely respected theory of "client-centered counseling" which suggested an interesting group technique.² Named the Spiral Response, it applies in a group setting some of the basic Rogerian insights regarding communication. The device takes its name from the fact that it causes direct member-involvement to move in a kind of spiral around the conference table. Properly used it can dramatically improve communication and accelerate the development of rapport

¹See Appendix III, A, pp. 108-112.

²Carl R. Rogers, Counselling and Psychotherapy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942). Dr. Rogers has since relocated.
among group members at the beginning of a course or series of meetings.

The Spiral Response requires an advance assignment. Each group member should come to the session prepared to make a two-minute talk on the topic, "An Unresolved Problem I Face in My Work." The term "unresolved" is important; if the problem has already been solved, it may lack interest for the group . . . and challenge for the listener.

Now visualize the typical conference group seated around the table. Start with the person on the leader's left and name the members, A, B, C, etc.

To begin the Spiral Response, Mr. A will state his "problem." He will state it loud enough for all to hear, but he will address his remarks to Mr. B. Mr. B will listen carefully. Then, when Mr. A has finished, Mr. B will play back in his own words the message Mr. A has communicated to him. Mr. B will use his own words (so that more than memory is required), but he will try to avoid omitting, adding or distorting anything in making his playback.

The rest of the group will listen carefully also--for when the A-B exchange is completed, the group must identify any omissions, additions, or distortions that
have occurred in it. The group will also be asked to compare the emotional temperature of A's original message with that of B's playback; changes in the level of abstraction, for example, may be a clue.

The discussion leader will add his critique to that of the group--making sure that even minor differences in subject content and emotional overtones between the original message and playback are recognized. Only his insistence upon a detailed critique will enable the process to maintain adequate challenge for the group.

Frequently the group will want to wander away from a concern with the accuracy of the communications exchange--to a concern with solving the problem Mr. A described. The leader must not allow this to occur. If interest in Mr. A's problem is high, it may be wise to promise the group they can deal with it later on. In any event, the group should be held to critiquing the communications exchanges during the Spiral Response.

When the group and the leader have finished their critique, Mr. A may be asked to give his own appraisal of Mr. B's accuracy in making the playback--and of the thoroughness of the critique.

Then with the first exchange completed, Mr. B now states his own problem to Mr. C. Mr. C plays it back and
the group and leader do their second critique. Mr. B then comments on the accuracy of the playback and critique.

And the process continues in a kind of spiral around the table—with each group member first playing back a neighbor's statement and then stating a problem of his own. Hence, the name, the Spiral Response.

When thoroughly done, the process requires about 10 to 20 minutes of session time for each member of the group. In a series of two-hour discusional meetings it is effective procedure to devote half of each of the first few meetings to the Spiral Response, the other half of each to case study discussion— or whatever other discussion methods are to be employed.

Persons who have engaged in the Spiral Response report (or exhibit) several benefits from its use.

1. It induces greater concentration in listening than most people have previously experienced. Groups frequently report being physically exhausted after an hour of this kind of listening.

2. The group learns much about the communications tendencies of its members. The members' ability to communicate effectively with each other tends to increase
at a faster rate than occurs in open discussion.

3. From the inventory of individual problems cited, the group learns a great deal about the background, interests, and needs of its members.

4. During the critiquing of the various communications exchanges most of the basic human errors in communicating are identified. For example, the listener will rearrange puzzling data in a pattern more satisfying to himself—or omit illogical material—or add interpretive remarks in his playback based on highly personal assumptions he has made while listening.

5. The "listeners" learn how helpful it is to suspend judgment until you understand what a person is trying to tell you—instead of deciding too quickly what is intended and pretending to listen while shaping a reply.
6. The group discovers—or rediscovershow much a person's point of viewaffects what he hears.

7. The group tends to mature as a groupmore quickly than when the Spiral Response is not used. Often a degree ofcohesiveness and rapport that mightotherwise be reached in about thefourth or fifth meeting can be achievedin the second or third session.

8. Strenuously exercising the members'listening skills so early in a seriesof meetings may enable them to get moreout of subsequent sessions.

9. Focusing attention on the process bywhich the group is communicating(rather than on the subject matter alone)may help members learn from the clinicalsituation in which they find themselves.Sometimes what the group learns by study-ing the process in which they are engag-ed is closely related to the subjectmatter they are studying. In any event,
their analysis of the process will help them to relate more effectively as members of a group and thus facilitate learning.

E. Attendee Reports

Each meeting of the Seminar, except for the first one, in the eight-meeting series began with two or more attendee reports on topics of interest to an industrial manager.\(^1\) The reports were of three to five minutes duration and were followed by five to ten minutes of group discussion led by the reporter. Since the entire group had studied the material upon which the report was based, the reporter did not review the material. Instead he addressed himself to the implications of the material for the group and to his own personal opinions on the material. The reporter gained experience in self-expression and discussion leading in the process.

Among the subjects used as a basis for attendee reports were the following essays prepared by the Seminar leader; the titles are assembled in categories related to the management process:

\(^1\)See Appendix II, C, pp. 95-98.
MOTIVATION: Never Let Employees Know Where They Stand -- Human Nature Abhors A Vacuum, Too -- People vs. Puppets -- Optimist or Pessimist -- When You Stretch an Elastic Band -- The Problem of Over-Reach -- More Than Money -- Who Knows What Employees Want? -- Of Bread and Hyacinths

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS: Let's Scrap the Golden Rule -- How Do You Define Common Sense? -- Can A Group Become Emotionally Ill? -- A Predilection for Absolutes

COMMUNICATIONS: On Seeing Less Darkly -- The Option That Isn't There -- Upon A Different Design -- On Avoiding the Use of Should -- Advice is More Blessed to Receive -- How to Avoid Asking Foolish Questions -- Always Suspect the Worst -- The Eddying Concept

AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS: There But for the Grace of God -- The Three Little Delegation "D's" -- On the Nature of Mutiny -- And Whether Pigs Have Wings -- Questions the Boss Can't Ask -- Authority As A Reciprocal Process

ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: The Slow Shuffle -- Holding the Invisible Horses -- Let's Be Practical -- Don't Let George Do It -- When Things Get Back to Normal Again -- The Reasons It Can't Be Done

PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING: On Doing Things By Littles -- The House That Logic Builds -- Putting That Other Foot Down -- Where Does 3,000 Miles of Walking Take You? -- The Hazards of Not Wanting Well -- Pace and Stamina Win, Not Speed -- On Firing the President -- The Non-Factual Elements in Decision
F. Case Study Discussion

In most Seminars, the Introduction to The Administrator case book was used to acquaint attendees with the nature of the case study discussion in which they would be engaging. Also used for the same purpose was certain related material prepared by the Seminar leader.

One of the more popular methods of participative instruction, case study discussion, involves the use of cases drawn from actual experience in the area of the subject being studied. Whether the case describes situations in an educational, industrial, or governmental environment seems to have little effect upon their usefulness. Particularly in dealing with subjects like management policy, organizational relationships, or communications, case study discussion has proved remarkably

---


2 See Appendix III, pp. 119-123, for material presented to attendees regarding the use of case study discussion.
The Objectives of Case Study Discussion

Case study discussion as used in the Seminar on Organizational Relations is designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. To improve the ability of a group's members to communicate with each other both in and outside the conference. It focuses the attention of all upon a single situation, set of problems, case of characters, and environment. As they talk with each other about this common subject, the members gradually learn more about what each means by the word-symbols he uses.

2. To secure exploration of a subject area in which individual judgment and the interpretation of facts are essential to learning.

3. To develop team spirit and cooperative

1 See Appendix II, D, pp. 98-102, for a specimen case study used in the Seminar.
behavior in a Seminar group. Discussion of a series of case studies tends to meld the conference members into a more effectively coordinated group.

4. To provide exercise in the analysis and handling of complex situations involving several interrelated (and interacting) problems and personalities... all relative rather than absolute, all in a state of flux.

5. To provide experience in the treatment of situations in which many of the facts are unknown. The value here, of course, lies in the case's parallel to the situations we face in our every-day work. In the typical real-life situation, we often must act without knowing "all of the facts." If people are involved in a situation, all of the facts can never be known. There is no way to get inside other people's heads.

6. To give the group exercise in dealing with circumstantial versus factual
evidence, with second-hand evidence versus things the member has himself observed first-hand. If, in his regular job, the group member must rely on and work through other people, he needs proficiency in dealing with circumstantial evidence.

7. To provide insight for each member into the minds and personalities of other members of the group.

8. To sharpen each member's skills in listening, self-expression, persuasion--and, occasionally, in debate.

9. To develop awareness of the impact of each member's background, work experience, and personality upon his reactions and behavior in a given situation.

10. To improve each member's respect and tolerance for the viewpoints and judgment of others.

11. To provide--if a series of conferences
takes place—an experience for the group in how a group changes and grows during a series of sessions.

12. To illustrate—again in an extended series of case study conferences—how various group pressures influence the behavior of individual members of the group.

Why a Series of Case Study Discussions is Most Effective

Fully effective case study discussion seems to require a series of conferences for several reasons. The average group, conditioned to conferences on a single issue or problem, may well be confused at first by the complexity of the general case study discussion with its multiplicity of "facts" and issues. They may become frustrated by their inability to digest the case completely and work through to a pat solution for what they consider its most important problem. In fact, such a problem, if it exists, may never be clearly identified. And often there will be no single problem that all members of the group can agree is the dominant one.

Furthermore, the objectives we listed could be so
lightly treated in a single session, that the group would be unaware of their being approached at all. Thus, the net result of a single conference could simply be to confuse the group, give them an inadequate and "lost" feeling, convince them--in self-defense--that case study discussion is valueless.

Demands upon the Discussion Leader

Another aspect of case study discussion in the subject areas of the Seminar which deserves attention here is the demands it makes upon the leader. These are more severe than is sometimes recognized, especially when one is dealing with a group largely comprised of persons who are adult, widely experienced, and of demonstrated managerial competence. It must be noted that this approach to the leadership of case study discussion does not apply in all situations, with all subject content, or with all kinds of attendees.

The attitudinal environment of instruction is so vital a factor in the success of participative instruction that it deserves particular attention.

How can a leader create this kind of environment? There probably is no way of saying accurately how it is done. Such a climate must be experienced to be understood. Still, there is a theory we can borrow from the
physical sciences that may help to explain our meaning. It suggests a passive way to stimulate the initiative of a group. If it seems to understress the active elements in the leader's role, accept it as an antidote to the traditional emphasis on the all-encompassing accountability of a leader.

Autocratic concepts of leadership frequently tend to limit the effectiveness of the leader who would induce his group members to share accountability for the success of an enterprise. By emphasizing the responsibilities of the leader, such concepts can cause him to over-participate in an undertaking.

Consider, therefore, a concept in leadership that might be called the Vacuum Theory. It suggests that a leader use inaction—as well as action—to accomplish his objectives. It does not relieve him of accountability in any way; nor does it suggest that he abdicate his authority. It does, however, identify certain values in the leader's exercise of prudent restraint.

As in physical matters, nature abhors a vacuum, so in a leadership situation it is unnatural for a vacuum to remain unfilled. Thus, a leader who can resist taking too many leading actions will often find that his group members will assume accountability themselves.
In case study discussion, for example, the leader who, during a lull in the discussion, says nothing will find that his members are less able to tolerate silence than he is. If he is patient--and appears undisturbed--they will eventually yield to the unbearable pressure of silence and begin to talk.

If, on the other hand, the leader fills such a lull with his own comments--or leading questions--the group will tend to relax and let him do all of the work for them. Or they will briefly answer his questions and allow more lulls to occur. This, of course, is the beginning of a vicious cycle that results in a question-and-answer session at best--a lecture at worst. It is not unlike what happens when over-protective parents limit the development of their children. Since most group members do abhor a silence vacuum, however, they will act to prevent it if the leader appears content to let it occur. This sets up a reverse trend in which periods of silence may initially be long, but tend to become shorter as the session progresses--and ultimately to disappear. Thus, the patiently silent--or inactive--leader is often the one who, in the long run, accomplishes most. His strategic inaction impels his followers to become leaders themselves.
As earlier noted, the kind of attendee is an important factor in the use of case study discussion. The Seminar attendees were typically experienced businessmen in the 30 to 50 age range. Their work and recreational patterns often made a homely analogy between case study and poker meaningful to them. In a sense, they were preconditioned by their experience to find case study discussion both interesting and beneficial.

The analogy referred to served to facilitate their recognition of the values they could expect to find in the discussion of business cases.

It was pointed out to attendees that: Anticipating a group member's reactions to the discussion of a case is like trying to tell you how you would feel in a poker game for stakes ten times as high as any you have ever played for. It is likely that in addition to intellectual exercise, some emotional involvement will occur.

To continue the analogy, it is also difficult in either situation to suggest how you should behave. Your experience, your attitudes, your skill, and the cards you hold . . . must determine your behavior.

In case study discussion, only a few of the facts are ever present--just those the case writer happened to consider significant, or was able to discover.
Still, as in a poker game where you are certain just of the cards in one hand, it is sometimes possible to take action on the basis of useful assumptions that stem from your experience and the few facts at your command.

Thus, as noted earlier, case study discussion cannot be expected to work equally well in all situations, with all subject content, or with all kinds of attendees. In the instructional situation being treated here, the leader had to be thoroughly familiar with the cases to be used. He refrained from imposing his interpretation of them upon the group. Otherwise, the group's learning would have been limited to what the leader had found in the case. And often this was a very small portion of its content, no matter how great his experience with the case.

The leader tried to behave in a manner that would cause the group members to develop their own capabilities in the discussion, instead of making them dependent upon him.

But more important was the self-concept he held—the attitudes with which he approached his conference task.

If the leader had considered himself an expert on
the case, and underestimated the competence of the group, he would have been lost before he began. The discussion would likely have turned into a guessing game in which the group simply played back to the leader's interpretation of the case.

If the leader had taken a firm stand on any issue in the case, the group would have stopped trying to do its own thinking on this issue.

If the leader had picked a fight with a group member, the discussion would have degenerated into bickering at one extreme or non-productive agreement with the leader's viewpoints at the other.

The leader's function was largely to understand--and help the group understand--the meaning and significance of each comment that was made.

An exception sometimes occurred when the group had become convinced that its leader was non-autocratic, permissive, had confidence in their ability to stand on their own feet and solve their own problems. When this realization was present, they often were able to accept the leader as an almost full-fledged member of the group. When they did thus accept him he was able to serve as a resource person and out of his experience with the case, make an occasional comment on it himself or point out a
fact which had apparently been overlooked.

In order to preserve the group's initiative and interest, however, he tried to avoid ever becoming defensive when the group took issue with his comments. When these were injected at all, the leader's personal comments on the case were presented simply as additional ways of looking at the situation. No claim was made, even by implication, for their superiority to the group's own opinions on the issue in question.

It was no easy trick for the Seminar leader to learn all he had to know about the case before going into Seminar, and still avoid imposing his personal convictions concerning the case upon the group. But he felt that if they were to learn to think for themselves, this had to be done.

In addition to general discussion of a case study, a somewhat more structured pattern of discussion was frequently used. One example of it involved splitting a Seminar group into smaller discussion groups to spend 20 or 30 minutes in identifying major issues in a case. Then the Seminar group reconvened to consider the findings of the small groups. When a consensus regarding the two or three most significant issues had developed, the Seminar group again broke up into smaller groups to shape
courses of action designed to treat these most significant issues.

As a final step, the total group convened once more—this time to discuss the courses of action the small groups had developed. Often the leader used a blackboard or tear chart to help the class keep track of its findings at various stages of the process. This was a more problem-centered approach to case discussion than earlier described. It had the virtue of bringing issues and courses of action into sharper focus. On the other hand, it sometimes resulted in a less thorough exploration of the varied implications in a case than a less structured approach would have secured.

G. Lectures and Lectureettes

The use of the lecture method in the Seminar differed in at least two ways from its use in many other instructional settings. Essentially, both differences derived from the smallness of the Seminar group and the flexibility designed into the Seminar structure. These elements permitted the leader to keep his lectures brief (more lectureettes than otherwise) and highly informal. It also permitted him to vary the places in the Seminar where the lectures were presented so that, to the best of his ability, they were timed to each group's readiness to
receive the concepts to be presented in the lecture. This appeared to vary widely from group to group, and while it was impossible to estimate the timing with complete accuracy, this approach did seem to have considerable value. And when the timing was right, the lecturer was rewarded by observing intense absorption and accelerated learning on the part of the group.

Sometimes the lectures comprised straight exposition and on other occasions, they were augmented by handout material or blackboard work.¹

II. Role Playing

Another instructional technique used in each Seminar was role playing. There are so many different kinds of role playing and they are so exhaustively treated in the literature of Norman Maier of Michigan University,² and others that the best recourse here is to rely upon the Appendix section of the thesis to convey an understanding of the particular form of role playing used in the Seminar.³

¹See Appendix II, E, pp. 102-106, for examples of the lecture material used in the Seminar.


³See Appendix III, C, pp. 115-119.
More, perhaps, than any other single technique applied, the role playing met a widely mixed response from Seminar members. Some felt it to be the high point of the Seminar experience; others felt it had very little value. This, of course, will be noted in more detail in Chapter VII.

Also treated in Chapter VII, rather than here, will be the technique of the Discussional Summary, since this was part of the attendees' evaluation of the Seminar.
A. Discussional Summary\(^1\)

In the last meeting of each Seminar, each attendee identified orally the item(s) he liked most or found most useful in the entire Seminar experience. He also identified the item(s) he liked least or found least useful. Attendees were encouraged to be completely objective in doing so in order that the whole Seminar group, in each instance, might benefit from finding how the experience appeared to the individual attendee. It was also pointed out that the inventory of "most useful" and "least useful" items could lead to the improvement of future Seminars.

Essentially, the subject content of the Discussional Summaries paralleled that of the written evaluations and will, therefore, be adequately treated in the review of written evaluations to follow.\(^2\) The chief values of the

\(^1\)See Appendix IV, Section A, pp. 126-139, for specimen Discussional Summary.

\(^2\)See Appendix IV, Section B, Items 3 and 5, pp. 141 and 148, for written examples of the kind of comments made orally as well.
oral evaluation were: 1) its allowing all attendees to secure a face-to-face impression of the Seminar impact upon each member of the group, and 2) its helping both the Seminar leader and the attendees to interpret the written evaluations when these were received. The Seminar did constantly evolve throughout the five-year period under study; and the attendee evaluations, both oral and written, contributed materially to its improvement. For instance, attempts to make the subject content more practical (directly work-related) and to increase attendee participation continued throughout the period. 1

B. Written Evaluations

Each of the six Seminars treated herein received two written attendee evaluations, one immediately following attendance and a second, 90 days thereafter. 2 These were anonymous and this fact was emphasized in requesting them of attendees. As totaled for the six Seminars, they indicate a quite favorable impact in terms of attendee reactions. The comparison of the immediate and 90-day

---

1 Table No. 2, pp. 65-66, records just the most frequent responses; other similar evaluation responses indicated more practicality and participation. (Table No. 1 was moved to improve textual sequence.)

2 See Tables Nos. 3 and 4, pp. 67-68, in relation to evaluation observations in Chapter IV, Section B.
delayed evaluations shows expected regressions in some cases and unexpected gains in others. Normally the 90-day delayed evaluation of related training courses in the writer's experience has shown an almost consistent decline in values associated by attendees with the evaluation subject between immediate and delayed valuations. Hence, the item gains in Seminar values as viewed by attendees 90 days following the experience may be assumed to indicate aspects of the Seminar more than usually strong and lasting in their impact upon attendees.

As shown in Table No. 2, these included items indicating that the Seminar was a sound investment; that the Seminar subject matter, instruction methods, group make-up, and idea-sharing opportunities were appreciated; that the role playing was quite generally unappreciated.

Similarly, the additional trends in attendee opinions shown in Table No. 2 indicate that attendees felt the Seminar to be of value for "selected employees" (in this context, probably, for these, in addition to supervisors and managers). And this, of course, may reflect an increasing awareness of attendees--upon

---

1 See Table No. 2, p. 65.
return to their regular work—that the Seminar had values for the technical specialist as well as for supervisors and managers. There were, likewise, gains in the opinions that the Seminar should be given entirely during working hours, that the course should continue unchanged and that it was among the better courses attended (which "gain" is more appropriately a "loss" since it is at the expense of the opinion the Seminar "was the best such course" attended).

Table No. 3 on page 67 indicates the trend of selected written evaluation responses throughout the sequence of six Seminars.

One other less formal evaluation procedure helped materially to bring into focus the impact of the Seminar upon subsequent attendee behavior. This comprised informal sampling of the opinions of the attendees' work associates during the six months following attendance. The manager of Employee Development interviewed associates of approximately one-third of the attendees, including about equal proportions of superiors and peers in the interviewing.

While no written tabulation of the interview results was made and pencil notes on them are no longer
available,¹ the writer's recollection of them is that they did indicate some apparent changes in attendee behavior on the job.

Foremost among these apparent changes were the following:

1. An improvement in the attendee's communicating with his associates.

2. A more favorable attitude toward his work.

3. Increased interest in areas beyond the narrow confines of his immediate assignment.

4. Better relations with members of departments other than his own.

5. More interest (and skill) in helping to solve departmental problems.

6. Greater interest in his work.

7. More attention to collecting pertinent

¹These notes were lost or destroyed in the dislocations following the July 1, 1965 merger.
data prior to making a decision.¹

There were scattered negative responses in the interviews as well, especially on the part of older associates; and these focused largely in the area of the extra workload imposed by the attendee's absence from his regular work and the futility of off-the-job training of whatever kind. The negative comments occurred largely among peers rather than among superiors or subordinates, which may have indicated the presence of some bias. This possibility is heightened by the clear recollection that no such comments originated with respondees who had themselves attended the Seminar.²

While it is not possible to relate the written evaluations to the informal sampling of associate reactions, a scatter plotting of the correlation between Immediate and 90-Day Delayed written evaluations is shown in Table No. 4, following. Table No. 4 indicates an approximately linear relationship between immediate and

¹In the instance of a few superiors who were interviewed, this was stated and viewed in a negative perspective, e.g., as taking longer to make up one's mind.

²Further comment regarding the impact of the Seminar series as a whole will occur in Chapter IX.
delayed evaluation responses for the most frequent responses by evaluation categories. Items falling to the left of the diagonal indicate a decline in volume between the immediate and delayed response. The item numbers refer to those appearing in the table in Appendix IV, pp. 131-133. And it should be noted that the comment indicating the least liked item in the course is an intrinsically negative response. Elevation along the diagonal indicates relative volume of the response.

That an approximately linear relationship exists between the two evaluations argues for the strength and retention of the opinions represented. That most of the points fall to the right of the diagonal may indicate that immediate opinions were reinforced to some extent when the attendee returned to his regular work assignment.
Table No. 2

ATTENDEES' MOST FREQUENT WRITTEN EVALUATION RESPONSES
TOTALS FOR SIX SEMINARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Immediate Evaluation</th>
<th>90-Day Post Evaluation</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar helped in present job</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might help in future job</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was indirectly beneficial</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be available to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected employees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All supervisors</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected supervisors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All managers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be given on company time</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar is a sound investment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most liked elements of Seminar:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction methods</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource materials</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study discussions</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group make-up</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea sharing</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill of instructor</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: See Appendix IV, pp. 141, 148, for complete listing of evaluation items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Immediate Evaluation</th>
<th>90-Day Post Evaluation</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least liked elements of Seminar:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes should be made</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative rating of Seminar:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best such course attended</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among better courses attended</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table No. 3

**TRENDS IN SELECTED WRITTEN EVALUATION ITEMS**

(The most frequent response in significant categories expressed as a percentage of the total for that item and Seminar. Immediate and Post combined.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Items</th>
<th>S-1</th>
<th>S-2</th>
<th>S-3</th>
<th>S-4</th>
<th>S-5</th>
<th>S-6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) Helped greatly in present work</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Seminar a sound investment</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53) Continue Seminar as is</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) Seminar among better courses attended</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An additional 53% wanted the Seminar to be longer.

**An additional 30% indicated the Seminar was the best such course ever attended.
SCATTER PLOT OF MOST FREQUENT EVALUATION RESPONSES
BY EVALUATION CATEGORIES - TOTALS FOR SIX SEMINARS

TABLE #4.

IMMEDIATE EVALUATION RESPONSES

90 - DAY DELAYED RESPONSES
CHAPTER VIII

SURVEY OF OTHER COMPANY EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR MANAGEMENT SEMINARS

A. The Aims

It was anticipated that the literature regarding in-company managerial development would not relate directly enough to the subject Seminar to answer some of the questions of interest in the thesis; and a review of the literature bore out this expectation. The literature tends to focus either on specific techniques or on broad developmental programs of managerial education, leaving the explicit nature of their component projects relatively unexplored.

Thus, to fill the void between the specific techniques, on one hand, and the generalized developmental effort, on the other hand, a Survey\(^1\) was conducted during March, 1967. The somewhat confidential character of its subject, certain time limitations, the desire to secure

\(^1\)As capitalized, the term, "Survey," shall refer throughout the chapter to the survey under consideration here.
direct responses from persons relatively high in their corporate hierarchies, and the nature of the questions to be posed in the Survey, militated against the use of a technically complex research design in the Survey project.

The research plan, however, did provide informally for taking into account many of the traditional elements in conduct of such research. The Survey was designed to ask specific questions of interest to the thesis in a manner that would permit relating their answers to the thesis subject. It was planned to reach respondents qualified to make the judgments these answers required. The need to survey a representative sample of companies similar to the Seminar host company was taken into account.

Care was taken in designing the research questionnaire to assure that its aims and intents would be as clear as possible in dealing with a semantically obscure and relatively abstract subject area; also, that it would require minimum time to complete the instrument. While specific data was sought, the form did provide space for entering additional information and explaining problems of individual adaptation in responding to the Survey questions.
The environment in which the questionnaire would typically be executed was also taken into account. Usually the respondents to be reached tend to carry heavy workloads, to work under considerable deadline pressure, and, by the nature of their corporate assignments, to be required to think of many things at the same time.

B. The Design

With all of these considerations in mind, the Survey form as presented in Tables 1-A, B, C, and D, following, was designed. In order to keep the responses focused upon the thesis subject, the questionnaire solicits comparative data on a seminar in the respondent's company which relates as closely as possible to the Seminar on Organizational Relations. The specific areas of interest are defined by describing in the left-hand column of the questionnaire the essential characteristics of the Seminar with which comparisons are sought. These characteristics are grouped in categories familiar to the respondent. A right-hand column is available for the respondent's entering of data regarding a related seminar conducted in his organization. And the form is laid out in a way that aims to suggest ease and quickness of response. Sending the form air mail and providing for its air mail return may have helped both to secure immediate response.
and to increase the number of respondents.

C. The Audience

The sample of corporate population used for the Survey consisted of the members of the National Industrial Conference Board's Council on Education Development and Training,¹ augmented by two persons with positions similar to those of the Council members but stationed in the petroleum industry. This permitted including three other oil companies in the sample of 24 corporations surveyed. Council members are required by the Conference Board bylaws to be the top ranking people in their respective companies in accountability for the management development function. Further, the Conference Board strives to achieve a representative cross-section of the larger and more progressive American corporations on its councils. Since the formal in-company managerial development program is a relatively recent arrival upon the U. S. industrial scene² and many smaller companies are still without formal internal programs of any kind, the Survey sample chosen was deemed likely to elicit more significant and useful data.

¹ National Industrial Conference Board, 945 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

² Most management development departments in American companies reach back no further than to the early 1950's.
Information regarding Conference Board membership is restricted to members, but certain characteristics of the Survey sample can be stated. Six of the manufacturing concerns included rank among the 20 largest U. S. companies. Banking is represented by one of the ten banks with greatest assets. One of the two or three largest merchandising companies is on the list, as is one of the world's largest utilities.\(^1\) Two of the top 15 integrated oil companies are included. Altogether the list contains companies in the following product and service areas: insurance, utilities, chemicals, foods, petroleum, farm implements, soap, banking, textiles, machinery, floor coverings, automobiles, containers, business equipment, electrical products, merchandising, and rubber products. With no more than two or three exceptions, each company represented in the sample is among the top 15 companies in its product or service area, and in a majority of instances, among the top ten.\(^2\)

There are in the list two representatives each of the utilities, chemicals, foods, farm implements, and machinery. As noted earlier, there are three petroleum

\(^1\)Data taken from Reader's Digest Almanac (Pleasantville, New York, Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 1966).

companies represented; and the other product and service areas have a single representative in the sample.

In terms of numbers employed, the companies range in size from about 2,000 employees up to the hundreds of thousands, with a median of approximately 40,000. Using an arbitrary estimate of the ratio between total employees and the number considered eligible for developmental courses such as the Seminar of 40 to one, based on the situation in the host company for the Seminar, this would suggest a total audience for similar courses in the median sample company of approximately 1,000 employees.

D. The Results

Of the 24 companies receiving the Survey questionnaire, 19 replied, four indicating they had no similar courses to report, and 15 supplying information concerning related seminars. The results of the Survey appear in Tables 1-A, B, C, and D, following, with certain explanatory notes entered in the right-hand column of Table 1-D.

In referring earlier to the specific questions to be answered by the research, it was noted that these were spelled out in the items in the left-hand columns of
the Tables wherein the subject Seminar was described—with the clear intent, of course, of finding whether in a representative sample of leading U. S. companies similar developmental projects were concurrently being carried on; and, if so, in what respects they both resembled and differed from the Seminar. In the main, these questions would seem to be quite clearly answered.

With an image of the Seminar structure and content in mind as outlined in the left-hand columns of the Tables, it may be of interest to describe the typical other-company course as indicated by the Survey data appearing in the Tables' right-hand columns.

The typical other-company course would be entitled "Management Development Seminar." It would be of about 24 hours' duration. Its main subjects would be Human Relations, the Behavior of Groups, Communications, and Problem Solving. Among its chief instructional techniques would be printed study material, case study discussion, lecture, oral attendee reports, demonstration, and role playing. Most often the course would be conducted by an internal specialist on management development. The typical attendee group would be both vertically and horizontally distributed and include professional employees, as well as managerial ones. It would be evaluated by
means of in-session oral methods, a written attendee evaluation immediately following attendance, and informal sampling of associates' opinions as to whether the course had an impact upon attendee behavior. The overall ratings would range somewhere between Excellent and Better Than Average. Median coverage would be about 375 attendees representing about 50 per cent of the eligible audience in responding companies. The course would have been available during a two-year period and about 22 groups would have attended or be in attendance at present. The typical course would be held during working hours at a general office, for attendees nominated by their superiors, with actual attendance a fairly voluntary matter.

Thus, in a fairly large proportion of instances, it seems likely that courses quite similar to the subject Seminar are being carried on in companies represented by the Survey sample.
Table No. 1-A  March 20, 1967

(Companies surveyed- 24) (Responses-19) (Completed forms-15)

PURE OIL COMPANY SEMINAR  OTHER COMPANY SEMINAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME: &quot;Seminar on Organizational Relations&quot;</th>
<th>NAME: &quot;Management Development Seminar&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DURATION: 20 Hours</td>
<td>DURATION: Range 8 to 150 Median - 24 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAIN SUBJECTS**

- Communications  
- Human Relations  
- Problem Solving  
- Decision Making  
- Organization Theory  
- Business Ethics  
- Behavior of Groups

**MAIN INSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES:**

- Case Study Discussion  
- Lecture  
- Demonstration  
- Printed Study Material  
- Oral Reports by Attendees  
- Tests and Quizzes  
- Role Playing

**OTHER SUBJECTS:**

- Applied Behavioral Concepts  
- Management by Objectives  
- Motivation

**MAIN TECHNIQUES:**

- Yes 10  No 5  
- Yes 10  No 5  
- Yes 8  No 7  
- Yes 13  No 2  
- Yes 9  No 6  
- Yes 6  No 9  
- Yes 8  No 7  

**OTHER TECHNIQUES:**

- Audio-visual media  
- Task Force groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. 1-B</th>
<th>Pure Oil Company Seminar</th>
<th>Other Company Seminar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEMINAR LEADER:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Company specialist on Management Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTICS OF ATTENDEES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Seminar group represented several departments, divisions and functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Seminar group represented two or more middle-management echelons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Seminar group contained managers and functional specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION OF RESULTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral evaluation by attendees toward close of Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous written evaluation immediately following Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous written evaluation 90 days or more after Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal sampling of peer, superior and subordinates' opinions re attendees' changes in behavior following Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEMINAR LEADER:</strong></td>
<td>Yes 11</td>
<td>No 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line and Staff managers, faculty members and consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARACTERISTICS OF ATTENDEES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMENT:</strong></td>
<td>Also -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Supervisors with superior potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight-line vertical groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION OF RESULTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also in-seminar peer ratings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURE OIL COMPANY SEMINAR</td>
<td>OTHER COMPANY SEMINAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATION FINDINGS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>EVALUATION FINDINGS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> The &quot;Seminar on Organizational Relations&quot; was generally considered to rate between &quot;Excellent&quot; and &quot;Better than Average&quot;</td>
<td><strong>(/)</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better than Average 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVERAGE ACHIEVED:</strong></td>
<td><strong>COVERAGE ACHIEVED:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> The &quot;Seminar on Organizational Relations&quot; was attended by 99 persons who were about half of the total population considered eligible to attend during a five-year period. Six groups attended.</td>
<td><strong>R - 106 to 3,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Attendees M-375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion this was of total population eligible to attend M-50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Period of years during which the Seminar was made available R-1 to 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Groups M-22.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS DATA:</strong></td>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS DATA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held at Home Office</td>
<td>Yes 9 No 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During working hours</td>
<td>Yes 14 No 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executives nominated subordinates to attend</td>
<td>Yes 11 No 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff specialist decided final make-up of each group</td>
<td>Yes 5 No 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of invitation to attend was fairly voluntary</td>
<td>Yes 10 No 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If attendee was absent more than 20% of course, he was dropped from Seminar</td>
<td>Yes 3 No 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Seminar was presented in eight 2-1/2-hour classes</td>
<td>Yes 2 No 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes were held one or two weeks apart</td>
<td>Yes 5 No 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also - a three- to six-day live-in session away from work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURE OIL COMPANY SEMINAR</td>
<td>OTHER COMPANY SEMINAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS DATA: (Cont'd)</strong></td>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS DATA: (Cont'd)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Two or more hours of home work were required for each class | Yes 11  
No 4 |

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Notes regarding the interpretation of Survey responses -

1. Each blank item was read as a negative response.
2. N/A responses were read as negative responses.
3. Extra-item responses mentioned are those with highest frequency.
4. Data on a single item was seldom complete enough to determine a mean.
5. Groups ranged from 10 to 35 members with the median between 20 and 25.
6. $R = \text{Range}$  
$M = \text{Median}$
CHAPTER IX

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Observations and Conclusions

What, then, are the general observations and conclusions that seem warranted on the basis of this study?

1. In general the Seminars, in the opinion of the attendees, their associates and the Seminar leader, constituted a reasonably successful project in the development of managerial and professional personnel. They appear to have contributed to the personal growth and career progress of participants.

2. The process used to select attendees suffered to some extent from the tendency of executives to use the Seminar occasionally to improve the morale of a restive employee regardless of his career potential. Perhaps in future projects of similar nature the impact
of this tendency upon selection can be reduced.

3. The use of participative instructional techniques for managerial and professional attendees was not only favorably received, but appeared to produce better results than were secured through non-participative methods. They are recommended by this experience for broader use in all developmental projects of related character.

4. The Seminar experience, supported by the Survey findings that indicate similar courses in many other large corporations, would appear to endorse the benefit of this kind of in-company management development.

5. Both the Seminar experience and Survey findings, supported by a great deal of the literature of personnel development and by the related experience of university graduate programs, appears to endorse the effectiveness of business
case studies as an educational medium, especially for adult audiences of considerable experience in the case areas.

6. The use of role playing in the Seminar type of setting, while it gives evidence of being both beneficial and widely used, may still require further refinement in an effort to improve its acceptance by adult business audiences. This is an area that deserves continued exploration.

7. Including a broad cross-section of functional specialties and a reasonably diagonal, vertical echelon distribution in the Seminar group appears to have many values. It is a practice that should be extended in future projects of similar nature.

8. The combination of managerial and professional employees (or functional specialists) in a Seminar group has values for both; it improves their understanding of each other and of each others' problems;
and it occasionally awakens unrealized interests, thereby providing career stimulus.

9. The treatment of Business Ethics in courses similar to the subject Seminar is evidently not common; the Seminar experience, however, would recommend its broader coverage.

10. Having attendees make oral reports on brief articles treating significant issues related to the management process proved to be an effective developmental medium. Its wider use is recommended.

11. The conduct of projects like the Seminar provides the specialist in personnel development a valuable opportunity to evaluate the career potential of attendees, provided that he allows for the many differences between the Seminar environment and the work situation.

12. The Seminar environment even on an
in-company basis affords great opportunity to the attendee to experiment in a low-risk setting with ideas and methods it would be much more expensive to test on the job.

B. A Final Comment

The informal research and study of the Seminar in Organizational Relations which the thesis presents has cast in a new light the total Seminar experience. The perspectives gained in going back to accumulate data concerning the Seminar, the searching out and re-evaluation of objectives, the examination of attendee characteristics, the weighing of impacts for components, as well as for the whole experience—these, in combination with the search of the related literature, have created a sharper image of the Seminar. They have added a degree of objectivity that should prove invaluable in using the Seminar experience as a basis for designing more effective development projects within the host company in the future.

The literature, while it contained few descriptions of courses approximately similar to the Seminar in pattern, was replete with evidence that the aims and methods of the Seminar are widely endorsed by industry
practice. The supplemental Survey indicated that the basic pattern of the Seminar is also a prevalent one among a number of the country's leading companies. Attendee evaluations presented still another essentially favorable view of the Seminar project.

In retrospect, certain elements of the experience appear to deserve increased attention in related projects of the future. Among these are: augmenting the cross-fertilizing effect of involving cross-section groups in a highly participative environment wherein the risks of trying out creative new approaches to problem solving are lower than in the real work situation; devising more ways in which developmental media may be used to both test and appraise the managerial potential of participants; designing into a seminar format more opportunities for attendees to learn by practice the skills of communications, interpersonal relations and business leadership.

In brief, the Seminar, in the light of the study described in the thesis, would seem to provide some of the foundations upon which to build an increasingly effective program of personnel development.
A. Specimen Announcement Letter

The Seminar in Organizational Relations is now tentatively scheduled to begin November 5. It will continue (with an open week or two) through eight 2-1/2-hour meetings concluding on January 14, 1964. When the previous Seminar was held last spring there was insufficient room for all of the candidates nominated. Also, additional persons may have become qualified to attend since that time.

The Seminar in Organizational Relations is a basic course for managers and technical specialists that is designed to contribute to the employee's personal development and career potential. It stresses the areas of communication and interpersonal relationships.

Ideally, a candidate for the Seminar in Organizational Relations should possess at least six of the following characteristics:

1. Proven ability in his type of work.
2. Better than average career potential.
3. Experience in supervision or in a technical specialty.
4. Five years' service with the company.
5. Some university education or its equivalent in self-education.
6. No previous participation in a major external or in-company educational seminar or course (20 hours or more) in the current half year.
7. Status reasonably compatible with that of other attendees.

8. An especially strong personal need that the Seminar may be expected to help satisfy.

Since the group must be limited to approximately 20 persons and the ideal group represents a cross-section of the organization, no more than four candidates from a single department or division should be nominated for the same Seminar.

In order to have the best chance for acceptance, the nominations for the Seminar in Organizational Relations should reach me prior to October 23.

B. Specimen Invitation Letter

The appropriate clearances have now been secured and it is a pleasure to invite you to attend the Seminar in Organizational Relations. It will be held between 9 A.M. and 11:30 A.M., Tuesdays, November 5 through January 14, 1964, in the Auditorium at the General Office. During this time period eight sessions will be so spaced as to make proper allowance for holidays.

About two hours of study will be required each week outside the Tuesday morning sessions. In fact, there is an advance assignment--so come to the first session prepared to give a two-minute talk on the topic, "An unresolved problem in communications or organizational relations I am experiencing." Also, please study the attached article by Carl Rogers.¹

I shall look forward to meeting with you on November 5.

C. Specimen Roster for the Seminar

1. To indicate horizontal and vertical distribution of a typical group.

¹Excerpts from Carl Rogers' paper, "Communication: Its Blocking and Facilitation," originally presented at Northwestern University on October 11, 1951.
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APPENDIX II

SUBJECT MATTER MATERIALS

A. Specimen Outline for Seminar

Meeting No. 1

Introductions

Attendees
Objectives
Methods

Uncritical Inference Test
Spiral Response
Members' individual problems

Meeting No. 2

Attendee Reports (3 or 4 of 5 minutes each plus discussion)

Quiz on U. S. A.
Case Study Discussion

Meeting No. 3

Attendee Reports

Demonstration on Multiple Transmission of a Message

Lecture - Hierarchy of Human Needs
Case Study Discussion

(Subgroups meet before whole group discussion to identify key issues in case and afterwards to develop specific courses of action.)

Meeting No. 4

Attendee Reports

Lecture - The Impact of Perceptual Psychology upon Problems of Interpersonal Relations

Demonstration on Creative Problem Solving

"Nine Dots" or "Sixteen Dots" problem

Case Study Discussion

Meeting No. 5

Attendee Reports

Lecture - Authority as a Reciprocal Process

Brain Teaser Quiz

Case Study Discussion

Meeting No. 6

Attendee Reports

Lecture - What Workers Want Most

Role Playing - "John Kempton" situation

(3-man teams, each including two players and an observer who reports back to whole group during critique.)
Meeting No. 7
Attendee Reports
Lecture - "Theory Y"
Case Study Discussion

Meeting No. 8
Attendee Reports
Case Study Discussion
Discussional Summary of Seminar

NOTE: Usually the final meeting was combined with a "graduation" dinner at which one or more officers of the company were guests.

B. Specimen of Tests and Quizes

1. Uncritical Inference Test

Instructions

Read the following little story. Assume that all the information presented in it is definitely accurate and true. Read it carefully because it has ambiguous parts designed to lead you astray. No need to memorize it, though. You can refer back to it whenever you wish.

Next, read the statements about the story and check each to indicate whether you consider it true, false or "?". "T" means that the statement is definitely true on the basis of the information presented in the story. "F" means that it is definitely false. "?" means that it may be either true or false and that you cannot be certain which on the basis of the information presented in the story. If

1Copyrighted 1955 by William V. Haney; reprints were purchased from Dr. Haney.
any part of a statement is doubtful, make it "?." Answer each statement in turn, and do not go back to change any answer later and don't re-read any statements after you have answered them. This will distort your score.

The Story

A business man had just turned off the lights in the store when a man appeared and demanded money. The owner opened a cash register. The contents of the cash register were scooped up, and the man sped away. A member of the police force was notified promptly.

Statements about the Story

1. A man appeared after the owner had turned off his store lights. T F ?
2. The robber was a man. T F ?
3. The man did not demand money. T F ?
4. The man who opened the cash register was the owner. T F ?
5. The store owner scooped up the contents of the cash register and ran away. T F ?
6. Someone opened a cash register. T F ?
7. After the man who demanded the money scooped up the contents of the cash register, he ran away. T F ?
8. While the cash register contained money, the story does not state how much. T F ?
9. The robber demanded money of the owner. T F ?
10. The story concerns a series of events in which only three persons are referred to: the owner of the store, a man who demanded money, and a member of the police force.

11. The following events were included in the story: someone demanded money, a cash register was opened, its contents were scooped up, and a man dashed out of the store.

Answer Key

1. A man appeared after the owner had turned off his store lights. (OWNER & BUSINESS MAN MAY NOT BE SAME PERSON)
   T F ?

2. The robber was a man. (WHY NOT A WOMAN?)
   T F ?

3. The man did not demand money.
   T F ?

4. The man who opened the cash register was the owner. (OWNER MAY HAVE BEEN A WOMAN)
   T F ?

5. The store owner scooped up the contents of the cash register and ran away. (COULD HAVE BEEN PROTECTING "CONTENTS")
   T F ?

   T F ?

7. After the man, who demanded the money, scooped up the contents of the cash register, he ran away. (DID HE SCOOP?)
   T F ?

8. While the cash register contained money, the story does not state how much. (WHY MONEY?)
   T F ?
9. The robber demanded money of the owner. (WHAT ROBBER?) T F ?
10. The robber opened the cash register. (IF A ROBBER--COULD HAVE RE-OPENED IT) T F ?
11. After the store lights were turned off a man appeared. T F ?
12. The robber did not take the money with him. T F ?
13. The robber did not demand money of the owner. T F ?
14. The owner opened a cash register. (VERBATIM) T F ?
15. The age of the store owner was not revealed in the story. T F ?
16. Taking the contents of the cash register with him, the man ran out of the store. (WHY "OUT?") T F ?
17. The story concerns a series of events in which only three persons are referred to: the owner of the store, a man who demanded money, and a member of the police force. (WHY ASSUME BUSINESS MAN AND OWNER ARE THE SAME?) T F ?
18. The following events were included in the story: someone demanded money, a cash register was opened, a man dashed out of the store. (WHY "DASHED." WHY "OUT OF THE STORE"?) T F ?

C. Specimen Article Used as a Basis for Attendee Reports

1. Original essay by the Seminar Leader
The Eddying Concept in Group Discussion

Have you ever heard someone say that a group discussion was dull and repetitious? Perhaps he was simply being accurate. Some discussions may really turn out that way.

There is, however, at least one other possibility to consider. Our critic may have been unperceptive. He may have been deaf--intellectually and emotionally--to much of what other discussion members were feeling, thinking and saying. You may remember the famous comment on an orchestra concert: that it was dull and endlessly repetitious, the way the violin bows all moved in unison and the drummer incessantly beat his drum. And someone has said of a famous painting that it looked pretty shoddy up close because of all those careless brush marks.

In a group discussion some members hear only the words that are spoken. Others "hear"--and find of perhaps greater significance--the non-verbal elements of communication. A smile, frown, change in posture or inflection or breathing, the speaker's timing of his comment, his varying pace in speaking, who replies to whom or does not, whose ideas are usually accepted favorably and whose are not ... these, too, are fascinating aspects of a group discussion. Is it surprising that the insensitive person--who misses most of this--will often find a discussion dull and repetitious?

There is another element in the communication of a discussion group that is frequently misunderstood. It may be described as "The Eddying Concept in Group Discussion."

Most of us, I suspect, take pride in considering ourselves "logical" thinkers. Very likely we tend to believe that we speak the same way. When we use the term "logical" we mean it in a mathematical sense ... as the theorems of Euclid are "logical." They are so because they arrive most expeditiously at a series of lasting truths.
There is an interesting difference, however, between Euclid's logic and the "logical thinking" upon which we pride ourselves. Euclid dealt in precise technical terms with carefully defined lines, angles and figures drawn on a writing surface. True, these marks had certain implications regarding similar design in nature; but Einstein and others have now shown that Euclid's truths are less true when applied to space than they seemed on paper. Still there was a certain intrinsic reliability in Euclid's theorems that has made them a favorite example of logical thinking. Our own "logical thinking" in a discussion, on the other hand, deals most often in loosely defined--often ambiguous--terms with a mish-mash of subjective data very little of which could be described as factual.

A more accurate view of the discussonal situation would make it one in which each member is using his unique private brand of logic "facts" that are not facts at all to anyone else, and words that have different meanings and varying emotional overtones for other members of the group. If Euclid had trouble with marks on paper carefully defined in technical language, you can see why "logic" is a somewhat complex matter when applied to group discussion.

Still, some discussion members want a discussion to follow a pattern that satisfies their own personal concepts of logic as applied to the subject being discussed. Always from his own personal perspective this kind of member wants the discussion to move in an "orderly" fashion--from where he starts to where he would like to go.

Instead--for the very reason that individual members have these highly personal perspectives, different starting places and destinations in mind--the discussion tends to follow the eddy­ing course of a mountain stream. The dis­cussion does double back upon itself occasionally to enlighten or give talking space to a member whose interest kindles slowly or whose starting or end point is far away from those of others in the group. There are occasional whirlpools where no forward progress seems to occur,
backwaters where purpose apparently dies. Sometimes fast as a rapids, sometimes almost like a pond, the discussion, however, does always move forward—as inevitably as our mountain stream.

And while there are consistent elements in it, a discussion changes as constantly as a stream. Each is a process in which—casual appearances to the contrary—no two moments are exactly the same. Two "identical" comments made by the same person with the same words and inflection but occurring at different times—and hence in a different context—can communicate completely opposite messages. And, of course, "identical comments" made by different persons are likely to have meanings as different as their makers are.

Anyone aware of the uniqueness of human logic and able to receive non-verbal communication will seldom find a discussion dull or repetitious. He will accept as both natural and desirable the eddying course that most discussion follows.

D. Specimen Case Study

1. An original case based on intra-company experience.

The Case of The Six Lab Conference Leaders

The Boxlite Company is a major maker of several kinds of packages, containers, and wrapping materials. The variety of its products requires the use of a large research and development staff who comprise a separate division of the company, and are quartered in a modern laboratory ten miles from the home office and are headed up by a Vice President for Research. Employed at the lab are 325 specialists and technicians, of whom about 80 are considered to be of supervisory status—either because they are actually responsible for the work of others or because their special skills entitled them to equivalent salary.

About half of the lab employees hold university
degrees for graduate study; almost all of the 80 supervisors (and top specialists) are in this group.

The Vice President for Research and his chief administrative aide, the Lab General Manager, decided to set up a supervisory development course for the 80 key personnel. These two men plus the Lab Training Manager and a member of the home office Personnel Department of Boxlite together planned a series of 10 two-hour conferences on the basic elements of a supervisor's job.

Subject matter for the course was of two types: case studies in communications and human relations drawn from industry and the Armed Forces; and an analysis of a supervisor's responsibilities, duties and qualifications to be developed in discussion by the students.

It was agreed that the original series of meetings for the first 25 supervisors (including the top echelon) should be experimental; future series would be revised on the basis of experience with the first group.

Six young supervisors in the lab were trained (by the Lab Training Manager and Personnel staff man from the home office) to provide non-directive leadership of the conferences. They showed so much interest in the course, and flair for moderating it, that they, with the Lab Training Manager and Personnel man, evolved into a kind of steering committee on the project. While the first series of 10 meetings was being held (at the rate of two per week), several informal sessions were held with the six conference leaders to adapt the course to experience while in process. Gradually the six leaders seemed to develop the feeling that the project more or less belonged to them.

The tenth meeting of the course was devoted to having the 25 supervisors in attendance evaluate the project. They made several suggestions for improving it, including the suggestions that 1) it be given at a faster pace, 2) it be made more practical, and 3) it be broadened in scope.
either immediately or in related courses to follow this first unit—to cover all areas of the supervisor's job.

Then a meeting of the "steering committee" was held to revise the course before presenting it to other groups. The Lab General Manager and Training Manager, and the Personnel man met with the six conference leaders for this purpose. The Vice President for Research was unable to attend this revision session but had sat in as an observer in about half of the 10 regular meetings in the course and had kept in touch with the project through the Lab General Manager and other key men. The steering committee worked up a complete new outline for the course, incorporating its judgment and the suggestions the 25 attendees had made. The revised course was to be 18 hours in length and to be considered just a preliminary course on human problems in supervision, with subsequent courses to be set up treating routine administration.

This new outline was then discussed with the Vice President. He approved of it in general, but proposed two changes: 1) the number of two-hour meetings in the series should be cut from 10 to six, and 2) the subject matter should include broad industrial cases involving routine administrative problems in addition to those just on communications and human relations—cases that treated more than just the personnel problems of the supervisor and placed emphasis on more of the routine aspects of his job.

He said in support of these proposals that if the broad industrial cases were alternated with communications and human relations cases throughout the course, the students would begin early in the series to develop perspective on how to apply the fundamentals of supervision to each aspect of their own work. He felt this would accelerate their progress, thus permitting the use of a shorter course. He pointed out, also, that the Lab General Manager and several of the key department heads favored condensing the course, and beaming it at all the practical, everyday problems of the supervisor—rather than just at his problems in dealing with people.
In the judgment of the Lab Training Manager and the Boxlite Personnel man, these proposals made good sense from four viewpoints:

1. The needs and interests of the group to be trained.

2. The regular workload of the trainees during the period in which the course would be given.

3. Their professional understanding of what would promote effective learning in the course.

4. The opinions and desires of the Lab Management group.

Thus they agreed to take up the Vice President's proposals with the "steering committee," and assured him they felt this group would wish to incorporate them in the revised course.

Another meeting of the steering committee was held and the Vice President's two proposals were discussed. The six young conference leaders, who had seemed "on top of the world" emotionally when they completed the revised outline of the course the previous day, now appeared to experience a radical change in attitude toward the project.

One of them stated what seemed to be a consensus of the six.

"These two changes put things in an entirely different light," he said. "They told us this was the most important project in the Lab right now. But if the Vice President—who didn't even attend all the meetings and wasn't in on the revision session at all—is going to step in like this and throw his weight around... well, I say it doesn't make much difference how we handle the other groups. Let's cut it to four meetings and use all straight industrial cases. The sooner we get it over with and get back to our regular work, the better for everybody."
The Lab Training Manager and the Boxlite Personnel man continued the discussion of the Vice President's proposals, until all of the young lab supervisors who had served as course leaders had exhaustively expressed their views. At the end of the discussion they felt the consensus of the group to be that the Vice President's proposals should be accepted. But the six leaders were clear in stating their opinion that the course would be less effective on the new basis.

Following this meeting the Lab Training Manager invited the Personnel man to his office to decide what, if any, further action should be taken with respect to revising the course. He said he was uncertain how to proceed.

E. Specimen Lecture Material

1. Lecture on Theory "Y"1

2. Graphic outline for lecture on the Impact of Perceptual Psychology upon Problems of Interpersonal Relations.

Theory "X" + "Y" = "R"

In the equation, Theory "X" + "Y" = "R," the "R" represents the realities of managing a business organization; and we shall come back to this later.

Douglas McGregor presents in The Human Side of Enterprise2 an illuminating analysis of two opposing philosophies of leadership. While admitting that his structuring is arbitrary, Dr. McGregor sees great value in

---


reducing the many different styles of business leadership to an either-or framework, saying that they tend to classify as either "Theory X" or "Theory Y" in regard to the basic assumptions they make concerning human motivation.

Theory X is the traditional approach to management of an enterprise. It is management by direction and control, in which essential authority resides at the top of the organization and is doled out sparingly under rigid controls. The employee's interests are assumed to be largely in conflict with those of the organization. He is expected to be no more honest, industrious and cooperative than necessary in order to achieve certain short-term, mainly selfish ends. Under an enlightened Theory X manager, the managing process becomes a rather complex form of manipulation, but remains manipulation, nonetheless. Under a benevolent manager, the relationship between superior and subordinate becomes paternalistic. In all of its many varieties, Theory X tends to create dependency on the part of the underling.

Theory Y, on the other hand, is an approach to managing in which the goals and interests of the organization and the employee are integrated to a degree that induces the employee to exercise self-control in voluntary pursuit of organizational objectives. Its psychological underpinnings are similar to the "needs hierarchy" theory of A. H. Maslow.¹ In McGregor's development of the idea, these are couched in six basic assumptions regarding motivation:

1. To work is as natural as to play or rest.

2. When committed to objectives a man will exercise self-direction and self-control in serving them.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

4. In the right environment a human learns not just to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. Capacity for imagination, ingenuity and creativity are widely distributed among employees.

6. Under present industrial conditions the potential of the average person is only partially realized (or utilized).

In direct opposition to Theory X, Theory Y has as its most significant characteristic the tendency to foster self-actualization.

As with many foods, however, some theories become more palatable when taken with a grain of salt. In McGregor's case the author himself has supplied the seasoning in an essay written as he returned to teaching after six years as President of Antioch College in Ohio.

... Before coming to Antioch ...

I believed, for example, that a leader could operate successfully as a kind of adviser to his organization...

I couldn't have been more wrong. It took a couple of years, but I finally began to realize that a leader cannot avoid the exercise of authority any more than he can avoid responsibility for what happens to his organization.

Moreover, since no important decision ever pleases everyone in the organization, he must also absorb the displeasure, and sometimes severe hostility, of those who would have taken a different course. ... This notion is not in the least inconsistent with humane, democratic leadership. Good human relations develop out of
strength, not of weakness.¹

Thus, McGregor's belief is not wholly made up of blacks and whites, but contains much grey matter as well. He would have been the first to endorse the flexibility of his findings in application.

Initially, we said that in the equation Theory \( "X" + "Y" = "R" \), the "R" represents reality. In his essay, "On Leadership," McGregor seems to appreciate the difficulty of making his Theory "Y" work outside the covers of a text on the management process. Today's typical corporate environment seems to be an amalgam of "X" and "Y." It contains elements of the structuring and control that characterize Theory "X," but these are by no means all-inclusive. It contains elements of the positive motivation and self-accountability of Theory "Y," but these are by no means all-pervasive. Employees are conformed to company patterns in many cases. But not without exception. In some instances, the dimensions of the job are shaped to the propensities and capabilities of the employee. When the incumbent changes, so do the dimensions of the job.

Thus, the "R," for reality, in a business setting would seem to be full of conflict and contradiction. Why have so many business corporations combining "X" and "Y" been so successful?

Perhaps, instead of defending either theory the students of management would be well advised to look for the most effective blend of the two.

There may be a mixture of "X" and "Y" elements that will prove as practical as the American compromise between private enterprise and socialism in the politico-economic sphere.

What is your opinion of Theory "Y"? How would you classify your own philosophy and practice of leadership? If you had your "druthers" would you change your orientation? If so, toward which end of the "X" and "Y" continuum would you move? Toward which end of the continuum does American industry seem to be trending? Why? Is the trend desirable in your opinion?
PROBLEMS of INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS (and so forth)
APPENDIX III

SEMINAR TECHNIQUES

A. The Spiral Response Exercise (an application of Carl R. Rogers' theories regarding communication in the Seminar group).¹

1. An edited transcript of a tape recorded in a Seminar session.

A Specimen Transcript of the Spiral Response

NOTE: Each member of the Seminar was asked to come to this session prepared to make a two-minute oral report regarding a work-related problem in which he was currently involved--preferably one for which no solution had as yet been achieved.

Discussion

Leader: Let's begin the Spiral Response with Mr. A's statement of a problem he is experiencing. Then Mr. B will play it back in his own words.

Mr. A: There is a communications problem in my Supply Department. We have about 20 men—10 here in the General Office and 10 more in our regional warehouses around the country. Frequently there are

¹Based on theories presented in Carl R. Rogers' Counselling and Psychotherapy (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942).
manufacturing changes made in the motors we handle—not major changes, just small improvements in a particular part. When this happens the part number is changed. A bulletin goes out to the whole company—including sales—instructing everybody to use the new number in ordering replacements of the part. Then we get rid of the obsolete parts and stock only the improved ones.

Our problem is that we invariably keep on getting orders for the old part, even as a replacement on newer models the old part will no longer fit. Sometimes this goes on for months after the change has been announced. When the new and old parts are completely interchangeable without any modification kit or mechanical adjustment, we simply ship the new parts, even on orders that come in with the old number. But often this cannot be done.

How can I get our field people—particularly our sales people—to order correctly and avoid all the mix-ups that otherwise occur?

Mr. B:

As I understand it, you have a problem with the system you use for numbering the components of your products. You have a Supply Department with 20 men in it and your manufacturing division makes model changes that cause confusion in ordering replacement parts. Now, we had a similar problem in my company and solved it pretty easily. What we did was to make the adapting kit or adjusting instructions an integral part of the package in which the improved part was shipped. That way we never had any ordering mix-ups no matter what parts number was used—either the old or the new.
Various Group Members: "Mr. B may have understood Mr. A's problem, but he gave no real indication whether this was the case. Instead, he plunged into 'solving' what he assumed was Mr. A's problem."

"If Mr. B had taken the 10 field supply men into account, a better solution might have been worked out."

"Mr. B failed to 'play back' the kind of product involved, the seriousness of the problem from a time standpoint (the mix-ups go on for months, etc.) and the detailed complications in making the changes--just to mention a few of the items his playback omitted."

"That last item--on complications in the changes--is a key one, I think. I got the impression that we were dealing with several different situations as regards the parts changes. For example--a straight, simple substitution, a substitution with a kit of adapting fittings, a substitution with special instructions for making the change, new parts that would not fit some of the models now in use, etc. None of this got into Mr. B's playback--or seemed to be accurately taken account of in the solution he proposed."

"There was no mention of the sales force as a special problem area in the playback either."

Discussion Leader: Let's consider another angle--"why" this happened. As a member of our group following special instructions, Mr. B started out to play back Mr. A's message all right--then got side tracked."
As a supervisor in his regular job, Mr. B is used to finding solutions for problems his people bring to him. This happens several times every day. What could be more natural, then, than to do the same thing--find a solution--when Mr. A made his problem statement in our Spiral Response. Even though Mr. B knew he was really supposed just to play back the message in his own words--but keeping his own ideas out of it--he couldn't resist the tug of the old habit. So he stopped playing back Mr. A's message and began helping him solve his problem.

Mr. A, please give us your personal reaction to what has been going on.

Mr. A: Well, I guess Mr. B really understood what part of my problem was... but not all of it. At least, it couldn't be cured just by packaging adaptor kits and instructions with the altered parts. You see, we had some old models in use that the new parts wouldn't fit at all.

Discussion Leader: Let me check something before I forget it. I thought you said in your statement that once the new parts are available you stock only new parts and destroy the obsolete ones.

Mr. A: Yes, I guess I did say that. What I meant was that we stock just the new parts in our 10 field warehouses and keep only a special limited stock of the old parts at the General Office until the models that use it are all out of service.

Discussion Leader: We have probably gone far enough, now, with this communications exchange to see that Mr. B did not fully
grasp the problem before trying to help Mr. A solve it.

NOTE: Now that Mr. A had stated his problem and Mr. B had played it back—and the exchange had been thoroughly critiqued by the group—the spiral would proceed to an exchange in which Mr. B stated a problem that was played back by Mr. C with further critiquing by the group. Thus, the process would move in a spiral around the conference table until Mr. A had played back the statement of the last member to report.

Since this was the first exchange in the spiral, the leader would make no mention of the emotional balance between the original message and the playback. Along about the third exchange he would begin holding the group accountable for this dimension of communication, also.

By "emotional balance" is meant the degree to which the message and the playback are similar in emotional involvement of the speaker—whether pronouns of the same person were used in both instances, the relative degrees of abstraction, similarities and differences in voice and facial expressions, etc.

B. Demonstration on Creative Problem Solving

1. The "Nine Dots" problem

2. The "Sixteen Dots" problem

The Nine Dots in Rows of Three

Our first puzzle is a quite familiar one. Its introduction should include mention that the

---

1. From an anonymous source.

2. An original adaptation of the "Nine Dots" problem.
ability to solve it seems to correlate inversely with the amount of a student's formal education, and with the amount of administrative experience and responsibility a person has had. There seems to be a positive correlation, on the other hand, between ability to solve this puzzle and the extent of an individual's creative flair. Business managers have typically found it very difficult to solve in the two minutes usually allotted; but professional writers and graphic artists have frequently found it easy. Youngsters given the puzzle have sometimes asked why the puzzle is considered difficult by adults. One other interesting aspect of this device is that its solution is hard for some adults to recall. Ten per cent of a group of business managers may solve the puzzle on a first attempt; two weeks after they have been shown the solution, twenty per cent of the group may still fail to solve the puzzle in two minutes.

Nine dots in rows of three are placed upon a blackboard or tear chart in this fashion:

```
. . .
. . .
. . .
```

Then the group member is instructed to "draw four straight lines that pass through all the dots without retracing or removing his pencil from the paper" on which he has duplicated the figure shown. As indicated above, two minutes is a reasonable time period to allow most adult groups.

Solution for the Nine Dots in Rows of Three

To solve the puzzle, you have to break out of the traditional pattern, escape the tendency to see the figure as a closed one. The answer demands an original approach:
A device like the Nine Dots puzzle can provide a welcome change of pace when used between two case study discussions in a seminar. When a group is bogged down in trying to solve a problem, the Nine Dots puzzle helps to get them going again. On many such occasions, its use has seemed to stimulate both interest and creativity.

Such devices, of course, should always be presented in a spirit of fun. Results should be understressed rather than emphasized—to protect losers and prevent winners from reading too much in them. It must be remembered that no direct relationship exists between the ability to solve such problems in the artificial environment of a seminar, and the ability to perform work in a real-life situation. Even the comments regarding the apparent correlations of this device to one's formal education and creativity need to be taken with the proverbial grain of salt. There are many, many exceptions to every such rule.

The Sixteen Dots puzzle is designed for use with groups that have seen the Nine Dots puzzle or would, in the leader's judgment, find the Sixteen Dots device more interesting. Everything said about the Nine Dots applies to this puzzle as well, except, of course, the substitution of the appropriate new numbers in the instructions. The group is given two minutes to draw six straight lines that pass through all the dots without retracing or removing pencil from paper.
The pattern is also similar:

• • •
• • •
• • •
• • •

And the solution is generically the same:

C. Specimen Instructions and Questions for Role Playing Exercise

1. An original role playing situation based on intracompany experience.

INTERVIEW WITH JOHN KLEMTON

Instructions to Supervisor

You are to assume that John Klemton, age 37, is one of the regular employees in your 13-man department. He is an above average employee, but is now at the top of his salary range and is two years away from promotion. He has been with the company 10 years.

You have been asked to reduce your department salary budget 10% during the coming year as part of a company-wide cost reduction program.
John Klepton visited your office yesterday to ask for a raise, stating that he deserves a merit increase and cannot make ends meet in his family budget. You asked him to come back today to discuss the matter.

In checking his personnel card, you have found that his last merit increase occurred 15 months ago. At the beginning of this year there was a general cost of living increase of 5% in which Klepton participated.

NOTE: In your own view, you are on excellent terms with your employees. You pride yourself on taking a personal interest in their problems, maintaining good informal communication with them and earning their loyalty. Some of the younger men in the department have received merit increases during the past year—where these were deserved and could be given without bringing the men too close to the top of their salary ranges.

Instructions to John Klepton

You are 37 years of age and have been with the company 10 years, most of this time in your present job, which you like very much. Your supervisors have always praised your work—indicating you are one of their best men.

Yesterday you mentioned needing more money "to make ends meet" to your supervisor, and arranged this interview to discuss a raise today.

Your last merit increase occurred 15 months ago, you did share a 5% cost of living general increase granted at the beginning of this year.

You don't really need the money very badly. You have your personal budget under fair control and are saving a small amount each month. A more serious problem is that five of your good friends in the department have had raises
since your last merit increase. You are not to divulge this information unless your Department Head succeeds in making you really want to tell him.

NOTE: You have always been a little skeptical of your supervisor's "hail-fellow-well-met" manner. You have observed that he usually gets his own way and does not seem to enjoy being opposed.

Recently your brother-in-law has been urging you to go into partnership with him in an insurance agency which he has successfully operated for several years. You have about half decided that you are in a "blind alley" in your present work and should probably leave the organization. On the other hand, you are not sure how well you could sell insurance or how easy it would be to get another job doing your present kind of work.

Instructions to Observer

Yours is a silent role.

You are to observe what occurs during the supervisor's conference with John Klemton.

You will later report to the total group, covering such items as--

1. The approach to the issue used by each participant.

2. Impact of the interview upon John Klemton's morale and productivity.

3. Whether the role playing seemed realistic.
4. Whether the interview uncovered any additional reasons for John Klemton's appeal for a raise.

5. What you would have done differently if you had been playing the supervisor's role yourself. (Please identify and comment on any positions assumed by the "supervisor"--or arguments presented by him--that you feel a representative of management should not use.)

KLEMTON ROLE PLAYING

Questions

- should company "plead poverty" in refusing a wage increase?

- should the 10% reduction be mentioned?

- should company use "cost of living" as an argument?

- especially when company frowns on employee's using budget needs as his plea?

- should a raise (or recommendation for same) be definitely promised?

- should a promotion be promised?

- should supervisor admit he has no authority to give raise?

- if a company pleads poverty during an austerity campaign, what will happen when the company has a good year?

- in fact, when company leaves the individual work and wage contract to introduce other arguments, doesn't this always open the door to extraneous pleas on the employee's part?

- should a manager ever admit he sides with
employee in taking issue with a superior or with company policy?

- should a supervisor ever plead weakness--inability to act when an employee makes a request?

- should a supervisor allow himself to become provoked or offended when an employee is "informal" or "insistent in asking for a raise?"

D. Case Study Discussion

Perhaps we should begin by saying what we mean by a case. A case is a set of facts about people in a specific situation. It involves personalities, an environment and behavior of significance and interest to the group. It is a slice of life. Whether it is "factual" or "fictional" makes little difference so long as the "fictional" case is true to life.

Ideally, it describes a situation which is complex, with many interacting human factors. And, again ideally, there are probably no "right" answers to the problems it raises. There may be, however, certain major issues to be identified by the group--and courses of action developed to handle them.

Assuming we have a group and a case study they have studied, what happens next can be stated much more quickly than it occurs. Essentially, all that happens is that
the group discusses the case. There may be all kinds of variations in the way they discuss it. The pages that follow will treat many of these. But, basically, the important thing is for the group members to apply their minds--and tongues--to the synthesizing of data into useful generalizations concerning the subject being discussed. It is a truism, of course, that with most art forms the more complex a process is the simpler it is likely to seem to the uninitiated. This paradox applies in an especially baffling way to case study discussion.

More puzzling to some people is the fact that often the group is not expected to find an "answer," or a set of answers to the problems raised in the case. In fact, in some cases the group cannot find "answers" . . . and there are several good reasons for this.

In the first place, the typical case has been selected or constructed so that many human emotions and attitudes are involved. No single answer, or set of answers, could cover the way a given person may react in a given situation.

Second the case never states all the facts. It couldn't. It is life-like in that respect. Do we ever know . . . with absolute certainty . . . all the facts
about any situation in real life which involves people?

Finally, suppose that, by a stretch of the imagination, an "answer" could be developed to fit a given set of facts, as set forth in a case. Even that "answer" would be of questionable value.

For example, suppose the case involves the efforts of Foreman Jones to explain the advantages of quality control to Employee Smith. A group decides that, considering all the facts known to them, Jones should have made moves A, B, and C. If he had only done that, Smith would have seen the light... to his advantage.

Of course, there's no certainty that those moves would have worked, since the group doesn't have all the facts. But assume, for a moment, that they did have all the facts. Do they have the "answer"?

We know that people are different from day to day. They are different from person to person. And they are different from situation to situation. So if we change either the people, the time, or the environment... we no longer have a valid "answer."

That is, we have an "answer" only to that one situation described in the case... involving Jones and Smith, at a specific time, at a specific place, under specific circumstances.
The "answer" won't necessarily help Foreman Doe when he talks to Employee Roe in a different environment. In fact, it wouldn't necessarily have helped even the original Jones if he talked to Smith just one day after the reported events took place.

Our answer, it appears, is not going to be directly useful to us.

So, if a case study group does not come up with "answers," what does it gain? It gains understanding of how a certain set of people reacted under a given set of circumstances. It penetrates quite deeply into some of the possible causes of their behavior and feelings. The exploration is broad because each member of the group brings to his study of the case a different complex of experience, knowledge, and attitude. The data in the case are examined from as many angles as there are members in the group.

The Preliminaries

The particular cases to be discussed will vary widely in length and degree of difficulty. The subject, the competence of the group, and other factors determine the selection. If long and difficult cases are used, the group must have time to prepare them in advance. Just
reading a case is seldom enough preparation to insure maximum benefit from case study discussion. Careful analysis of the case supported by notes is very much in order. In fact, it is sometimes wise to write a short paragraph on a significant issue in the case as part of your preparation.

E. The Seminar's Educational Approach

Learning as a group process goes back in history at least to 2500 B.C. and Sumer. In that fabled land between the Tigres and Euphrates rivers, in what is now Iran, many of our customs were first recorded in the Sumerian's wedge-shaped writing.

Samuel Noah Kramer, the University of Pennsylvania's noted Sumerologist, is our authority for saying that these first schools were at the opposite extreme from today's democratic, permissive or participative approach to education.\(^1\) The Sumerian schools taught cuneiform writing by rote and by liberal use of the cane.

Ever since Sumerian times, however, the process of learning has become increasingly a process of discovery in which students and instructor share. The trend has seldom

been consistent or even reasonably periodic. Still, when you compare one century with another, a persistent trend is evident. In our time there is a noticeable expansion of participative learning techniques out of the lower grades into the high school and college.

Whether in the demonstrations and symposia of the technical schools, the seminars in liberal studies or the case studies of the business schools . . . our colleges are engaged in participative instruction. Similarly, the proliferating media of adult education most often involve the student ever more deeply in the learning process. Especially in industrial education--or more properly, education in business and industry--is learning becoming a process in which the student is accountable himself for what he learns.

Since the ancient schools of Sumer, education has always been at its best an exciting process of discovery. The increasing participation of the student in learning warrants our presenting the Leadership of Learning as a process of shared discovery. Our view shall make of learning a process in which the instructor provides an environment that is at once both non-threatening and challenging. He makes certain that the student has ready access to the knowledge he will require. And the student
is accountable himself for what he learns.

The Seminar will involve the extensive use of small, face-to-face discussion groups. Some educators maintain that the tutorial relationship is best for learning; and the fact that learning occurs only on an individual basis is not disputed. There are at least two reasons, however, why we prefer to use group techniques. The sheer numbers of employees to be educated today militate against the use of the tutorial system. It was most practical when only a small portion of the employee group was considered eligible for education. The other reason is that under proper conditions the members of a small group tend to motivate each other, sometimes even to help each other toward understanding. Sometimes a kind of chain reaction occurs. Then each member of the group may build upon the interests and insights of the others.
APPENDIX IV

SEMINAR EVALUATION

A. The Discusssional Summary Held at the End of the Seminar

1. Explanation of the technique.


The Discusssional Summary

Much of what occurs in a series of discussion type meetings is likely to be interpreted in as many ways as there are members of the discussion group (plus one more for the leader). Each member will draw from the series a unique complex of impressions highly influenced by his own personal needs, interests, biases, background, and semantic sensitivity. Unless each has a chance to learn what the others have drawn from the shared experience, each member will have only his own subjective impression upon which to evaluate the course. Similarly, each is likely to overlook some of the insights others have discovered. And, finally, the discussion leader needs an opportunity to learn the impact of his work--not just in cold print, but also with the multiple perspective of the fact-to-face communication. He will want to improve future courses.

How, then, does the discusssional summary materialize? Long years of refining the process have led to a deceptively simple pattern. In a "round-robin" coverage of the group, each member states:

1. What he found least useful in the experience.
2. What he found most useful.

These two items may be any part of the experience--including the leader's performance. And each member should--insofar as possible--be limited to mention of one negative and one positive item. In any event, he is allowed to mention no fewer negative items than positive--so the session will not become a testimonial.

From a discusssional summary, both the group members and the leader can learn a great deal that cannot be conveyed in a printed evaluation form. With any participative learning project, its use is strongly recommended--with just one word of caution. The leader must maintain a "poker face" throughout the discusssional summary; and in his reflecting of member comments, he must emphasize the negative rather than positive impressions they report. Otherwise the summary will quickly lose objectivity.

The experienced discussion leader will recognize that he runs no risk in emphasizing the negative elements in the summary. Human nature is such that almost always the group member will make a compensating emphasis upon the positive in shaping his own personal reaction to the discusssional summary. Paradoxically, it is when the leader over stresses the positive that the members are likely to over value the summary's negative elements.

Transcript on the Discusssional Summary

An edited transcript of the summary evaluation of a 20-hour seminar: given by the participants during the seminar's last hour. Each group member is asked to identify what he found 1) least useful and 2) most useful during the entire seminar. It is stipulated that if he mentions more than one positive element, he must also mention additional negative elements in the same number. The seminar's subject was "Organizational Relationships" and its presentation involved the use of a wide variety of participative teaching methods. Quite a lot of case
study discussion occurred—some unstructured and some involving the use of subgroup work. Names and certain references have been changed to preserve anonymity.

Discussion
Leader: If you are ready now, gentlemen, let's begin the discussional summary of the seminar. Remember, as I told you last week, you can mention any part of the experience as either a useful or non-useful item insofar as you personally are concerned. Remember, too, that you will help us most if you single out one item on each side—the negative and the positive. If you do mention more than one positive item, you should mention the same number of negative items. We don't want this to turn into an old fashioned Methodist prayer meeting—or into a collection of testimonials.

What we do want is to let each group member discover what the seminar has looked like to the total group. In a discussional program, there is no practical way to do that—except to use a discussional summary.

Are you ready? We will begin with the man on my left and move in seating sequence around the table.

Alexander: What I feel was the least useful to me personally was the role playing. Where it would be of great value to a young student to learn techniques, I feel any of us with experience cannot benefit too much. And, I think each situation is different. With experience only can we learn these techniques. So I felt there was very little of use to me in that particular session. I felt the thing
of most importance to me was the discussion on listening and hearing the entire story before forming any judgment or coming to any conclusion. I found this has been a weakness on my own part. I don't always get the complete story, I think, before making a final decision. So this fact was most useful.

Bronston: Well, I agree with Sam on the least important session being the role playing. Basically because it's an artificial atmosphere. It won't fit into every situation. On the most useful, I think a lot of us were familiar with most of the theories covered in the seminar, but we thought of them as theoretical; bringing them out in the discussion here, we got more of a practical slant. Also, in many cases, points that I had missed myself in preparing the case were picked up later. I found it very useful to review after the session and see where I personally had missed some of the points that were brought up in the discussion.

Discussion Leader: All right. Next.

Claus: I felt the most useful part was probably this last session. I came to this conclusion after reading the material. I thought I was getting to more brass tacks. It is material that we can actually put into use in evaluating ourselves or things that we are going to do. On the negative side, I thought we spent a little too much time on the silent treatment. We had an awful lot of theory on this for almost five or six meetings, and I thought this was a little bit too
much time on this particular item.

Discussion Leader: I'm not sure I know what you mean by the "silent treatment."

Claus: Well, it's the theory and philosophy of doing an awful lot of listening.

Discussion Leader: Oh, the emphasis on "active listening."

Claus: To me, "listening" could have been handled probably in one or one and one-half sessions.

Discussion Leader: All right. Thanks. Now, let's move on to the next comment.

Dennis: Starting with the least useful, to me the least useful part of each session was devoted to summaries of reports which I had already read. I thought it was particularly useless when the report was so detailed that it inhibited all further discussion. Sometimes these details seemed to take almost half the time devoted to reports of this type. I think that possibly the report would have been better if the person giving the report had summarized his findings in one minute. That would leave enough time open for discussion in the group. The most useful thing about the course is that I did not know all the people in the group and I found that getting to know these people and their ideas, etc., has had quite an
influence on me. I also found the talks and the emphasis on the danger of making prejudgment, in particular, useful.

Discussion Leader: Next.

Ellison: I found the least useful part the attempt to develop a procedure to handle case studies in which we seemed to be floundering for an excess length of time in deciding what we were supposed to be doing with a case study. Probably it's a good training device, but I just thought it took too much time, that there should have been additional information given on using the case technique before we tried it. Most useful, I think, were the comments on things that we had read where the readings were contradictory. In a particular reading, certain statements would be made, and perhaps we'd all agree with them and then we read something else and a contradictory set of statements would be made and we would agree with them because it was a different situation. Just observing this I thought was worthwhile.

Discussion Leader: Our adjusting to these different points of view in varying situations was what you thought was useful?

Ellison: Well, the fact that everybody, not everybody, but at least some of us, accepted whatever we happened to be reading at the moment and didn't seem to correlate back to other things. There are so many contradictions in what we're doing. You're supposed to
be sympathetic. You're supposed to be this, you're supposed to be that. And all these things are always right when you are talking about the individual item, but yet brought together they're contradictions.

Discussion
Leader: All right. Next.

Flint: I think the least useful thing that I found in the course was the portion of a session on "multiple transmission." I think we are all aware that a story will be distorted as it is relayed from one person to another, and all this multiple transmission did was emphasize it. It included statements which were too obviously contrary to our background. The most useful portion of the course, I felt, were all the sessions on listening. I was aware of some of the theories involved in better listening, but this emphasized these and pointed out more specifically how the theories can be used.

Discussion
Leader: Thank you. Next.

Grundy: The most valuable thing that I have received from this seminar is the value that I place now upon communications with other people. I find myself now acutely aware of some shortcomings that I've had. The least useful, in my own opinion, was that some of these cases that were cited were rather intangible as they relate to my own personal experience.
Hale: The item that was the least valuable to me personally were the discussions on the theories of supervision. This primarily because of the department in which I work—where the job is relatively specialized. There is less opportunity to practice supervision, at least at my level. Therefore, these theories will have to be stored away until some future time when (I hope) I may become a supervisor. Of most value to me was just being able to speak out on various subjects in an atmosphere of acceptance. Even when there were arguments, it was a group that received ideas and exchanged views freely. Particularly beneficial was the broad diversity of backgrounds among the people represented in the group.

Ingwaldson: To me, the least useful item was the "vacuum theory." I'm sorry, but that left me cold, and I can't find any place where I could hope to use it in any group that I would conceivable have contact with. The most useful item to me was getting to know and understand better the other people in our organization, and learning how they think and how their minds work, while rationalizing the various problems that we have discussed in this course.
Discussion
Leader: Thank you. Next.

Jackson: I have a statement by Jim Walston I think is worth reporting. He's not here this afternoon and he asked me to make it a part of this discus-
sional summary.

Discussion
Leader: All right. Then you can follow it with your own comments.

Jackson: He said the least useful item was the "spiral response." Our thought became redundant after four or five cycles in forcing home the difficul-
ties of the listener in accurately playing back an individual's problem. He believes the same benefits could have been obtained by assigning four or five individuals to present the spiral response instead of attempting to get half way around in a group of our size. You will recall that we did not get completely around our group. He liked most the aids to leading a group, particularly the "vacuum theory," which he's had the opportunity of testing personally. It really works, he says. All through the seminar he picked up ideas that he feels cannot help but be beneficial in dealing with people, whether it's one man or a large group.

As for my own statement, I felt the least effective thing was the role playing. I felt that it stretched out; we never did complete it, and I think it could have been cut down consider-
ably in time. The thing I enjoyed most was the article on "active listen-
ing," which I believe benefits us all.
Leader: All right. Next, please.

Kobler: Well, the item that I, too, consider of least value was the role playing. I think that it has been mentioned before that in our normal routine we encounter this quite frequently. With the specific role that we played here, it was sort of an individual case which may have applied to our work or it may not have. I, personally, feel that we did not gain anything from it. On the positive side, I felt I obtained the most out of the many papers toward the end of the course, which got down to the practical aspect. I felt that some of the earlier papers were too much on the theoretical side. But I did gain a lot of value from the discussions that were held in which the group gave their thinking and developed a practical approach rather than the theoretical approach that was given in the readings.

Leader: Thank you. Next.

Long: The section that I felt was least valuable was when we would break up into small groups in the early case discussions and try to develop laundry lists of the main issues involved. We seemed to go for quantity in the issues rather than picking up just the key issues. I felt that quite a bit of time was lost in that. To me, the most valuable part of this course was re-exposure to the leadership skills that we've all been exposed to in the past. But in the normal hubbub of day-to-day activities you let them go
into the back of your mind and remain unexercised. I can see where re-
application of these skills can make your job easier without extending the
time required to do it in.

Discussion
Leader: All right. Next.

Mallott: The role playing, I have to say, was of least value to me; although I
wouldn't say that it was of no value. I think it could have been appreciably
better if there had been more of it. We have only one role playing situation
and I think that if we had several of the same general type, I might have
gotten more out of it. On the positive side, I have to say that there were two
items, actually, and I don't know which comes first. One is the opportunity to
meet a bunch of fellows in the organi-
zation that I probably wouldn't ever
get to know very well in the normal
course of business. The other one is
that this seminar provided an opportun-
ity to talk--enough to really talk
things out. And the talking was like
talking to a sounding board where I
didn't know exactly what I was going to
say sometimes until I said it. But by
talking enough and listening enough to
what other people said, the ideas that
I ended up with were not necessarily
the ones I started out with.

Discussion
Leader: Thank you. Let's have the next comment.

Nevers: Considering myself somewhat of a non-
conformist, and after listening to
the most useful and least useful
reasons that have so far been given, I
Discussion Leader: What worries you, right now, is a lack of specific information about how to remedy some of the weaknesses that are exposed. Just recognizing weakness, of course, is a step in the right direction. All right. Next, please.

Obenhaus: I feel, myself, that probably of most benefit were the small insights into the psychological reasons that motivate people. In some of these cases, I think we've seen them, and, also, there is the theory of "active listening." I've come to a very definite conclusion that the spoken word is seldom what it seems to be. On the other hand, I agree with many of the others that the role playing left a lot to be desired. I thought that it was not a true atmosphere and everything was being acted rather than experienced. For this reason, I feel that this could have been eliminated.

still feel that most useful to me was the realization that I am not a good listener. I prejudge; I do everything that we say is wrong in dealing with people. I am not a good leader, not a good administrator, highly negative all the way down the line. But I am impressed by the fact that we work for a company who will devote the time and effort to give us an insight into our own failings. Then, again, least useful, I found, was being awakened to these failings and then having the future fear of not getting any more guidance in becoming a leader, becoming an administrator, or a good listener, or not prejudging.
Discussion Leader: Thank you. Next.

Parker: To me, the least useful aspect was the lack of answers or conclusions in the cases we studied. We went to great lengths with "Annelo" and "Correlli," but I don't think that we came to any specific conclusions as to just what should be done with these people. There's a kind of a frustration there. And the most useful aspect, I think, was this exchange of ideas, getting to really know people to whom we just nodded in the corridors previously. It brings about a friendliness, I believe. One other value for me was the realization that every situation requires a search for things other than the obvious.

Discussion Leader: All right. There is one other comment submitted before the meeting because John Quill could not be here today. He found most useful the opportunity to share in a discussional interpretation of the complex ideas presented in some of the oral reports. He identified as least useful the fact that in a company he feels is becoming a "staff" organization, many of the case studies treated "line" versus "staff" problems and were quite elementary, besides.

That does it, and I'm obliged to you. I hope that you can see as a result of this experience that the Discussional Summary does have value in letting each of you see how the seminar looks to the rest of the group. I don't think (with the discussional approach that we've used in this series of meetings) the course is complete unless
each of you is given an opportunity to see what the impact of the course has been on the whole group.
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To: Seminar Participants
From: W. E. Bright, Jr.
Employee Development
Date: November 5, 1963

Subject: SEMINAR IN ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

The Seminar In Organizational Relations was a most interesting experience due to the widely diverse backgrounds and specialities of its members. From the moderator's perspective the difficulty of maintaining the balanced interest of such a group was more than offset by the benefits of bringing its members in contact and communication with each other.

Attached is a combined summary of the immediate and 90-day delayed evaluations of the Seminar. Also attached are four numbered items.

Exhibit #1 - Evaluation Form, Immediate Evaluation
Exhibit #2 - Transcript of Comments, Immediate Evaluation
Exhibit #3 - Evaluation Form, Delayed Evaluation
Exhibit #4 - Transcript of Comments, Delayed Evaluation

Very truly yours,

Bill Bright

WEB/jd
Attachments
EXHIBIT #1
EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
EVALUATION FORM

Name of Course (or Project) Seminar on Organizational Relations

(Immediate evaluation) (1-3)

Number of Meetings (or Separate Units) 8 Fridays (half-days)

Date Begun May 10, 1963 Date Ended June 28, 1963

Location(s) Where you Participated Palatine, Illinois (4-7)

Instructor(s) (or Leaders) W. E. Bright, Jr.

NOTE: Opinions of emphasis indicated by →. Strongest opinion in each segment is underlined.

NOTE: Please check every statement you agree with!

I. Personally I feel this course should be described as follows:

(8) 6 It has helped me greatly in my present job.
→ (9) 10 It might help me in a future job.
→ (10) 12 It was indirectly beneficial.
(11) 1 It was interesting but of no special help to me,
(12) ___ It was often boring but I did learn something.
(13) ___ It was both boring and pointless.

II. In my opinion this course should be made available to:

(14) 1 All employees.
→ (15) 8 Selected employees.
→ (16) 8 All supervisors.
(17) 5 Selected supervisors.
(18) 5 All managers.
(19) 3 Selected managers.
(20) 4 A few carefully selected managerial prospects.
(21) ___ No one.
III. The kind of development/training represented by this course should be scheduled:

- (22) 15 On Company time.
- (23) 3 Half on Company time, half on personal time.
- (24) 3 Entirely after working hours.

IV. In my judgement the money and effort required to make this course available are:

- (25) 16 A sound investment.
- (26) 3 A risky investment.
- (27) 1 A very poor investment.

V. I liked the following parts of the course:

- (28) 15 Subject matter.
- (29) 11 Methods of instruction.
- (30) 13 Resource or reference materials.
- (31) 3 Demonstrations.
- (32) 15 Case study discussions.
- (33) 3 Role playing.
- (34) 3 Lectures.
- (35) Visuals.
- (36) 12 Meeting room facilities.
- (37) 11 Hour at which meetings were held.
- (38) 14 Make-up of group attending.
- (39) 17 Opportunity to share ideas with other participants.
- (40) 15 Skill of instructor(s).
VI. I did not like the following parts of the course:

1. Subject matter.
2. Methods of instruction.
3. Resource or reference materials.
4. Demonstrations.
5. Case study discussions.
6. Role playing.
7. Lectures.
8. Visuals.
9. Meeting room facilities.
10. Hour at which meetings were held.
11. Make-up of group attending.
12. Skill of instructor(s).

VII. The following changes should be made in this course:

6. None; I like the course as it was.
5. It should be longer.
1. It should be shorter.
11. It should be more practical.
1. It should emphasize theory more.
5. It should be redesigned to change emphasis on subjects covered.
5. There should be more discussion.
0. There should be less discussion.
6. The discussion should be devoted to more appropriate subjects.

VIII. On the basis of its value to me in my work (and in comparison with similar courses I have attended) this course (or project) should receive the following rating:

8. The best such course I have attended.
8. Among the better courses attended.
3. Average among such courses.
1. Below average.
0. Among the poorer courses attended.
0. The worst such course ever attended.
IMMEDIATE EVALUATION
SEMINAR ON ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

May 10 through June 28, 1963

Participants' Written Comments Regarding the Program

Directly relating the contents of the seminar to my present work, I firmly believe that it has made me conscious of the problems inherent in speaking with others and of the strenuous effort that must be made by all communicants before any problem can be intelligently discussed and solved. I would suggest that the leader of the seminar impart more of his knowledge and experience--perhaps this entails a longer period of meetings.

My personal reaction to the course was rewarding, particularly the summaries given by those present at the end thereof. One suggestion I might make is that the leader not watch the clock and give the impression that we are not on schedule. The repeated comment "We're running overtime" or "We've got to move on" made me feel we had exhausted a subject when in fact we had not really gotten into it. Just move on without reference to time. It is gratifying to know how others think on the same questions and come up with different answers. I conclude that man by nature is good.

It did seem that we were always trying to cover a little more ground than the time allotted would permit. It occurred to me that it might be desirable to have as many sessions as required to get through the subject matter. That is, instead of a fixed schedule of eight sessions have seven to ten meetings according to the speed at which the group can assimilate the subjects.

I found the discussions and exchange of opinions very interesting and helpful as well as the opportunity of meeting other employees in similar positions. I found myself attempting to relate their opinions and remarks to their problems and departments as well as my own. The review of the various theories was most helpful.
Portions of the seminar were devoted to improving communications, a most worthy goal. The approach generally appeared to be an effective one and I believe I gained considerable benefit from the course material and discussions in this area. Some reading material, particularly the case studies, left much to be desired. The ensuing discussions took far too much time as the group sought to find meaning for the inclusion of the material. Whatever the value it could not justify the time taken. From my point of view, the group was too large by six to eight persons. I find a small intimate discussion most stimulating and enjoyable. As a group increases in size there occurs much repetition, redundancy and irrelevancy.

This seminar brought into focus the importance of little things that are frequently overlooked in dealing with people because of everyday business pressures—cursing, listening to others, spending time with people in the department. The correction of bad personal habits in this respect is not easy, especially if the same attitudes do not exist throughout all supervisory and management levels. I do believe that participants in this program will be more sensitive to the needs of their people and fellow workers, at least until this sensitivity is again eroded by paper and other business pressures.

I personally enjoyed the course very much. I appreciate the opportunity of becoming better acquainted with responsible members of our organization and learning how they think and react to the problems posed by the course. However, I went through much of the course wondering what the objective was and to what use I could apply the theories, etc. advanced. I feel that more initial emphasis on the objectives of the course and why each person was selected to attend would have helped to dispel this doubt. In spite of my own enjoyment of the course and the broadening effect it may have had on me, I have some reservations regarding whether it can be justified economically from the benefits which the Company might gain from it.

The seminar was an excellent opportunity to get to know other people in the organization who I might not ever have had the opportunity of meeting. The atmosphere of free discussion and thought is hard to match in the normal course of business and this has helped to, insensibly perhaps, build up a better background for dealing with personnel problems. It is much easier to deal with things than to deal with people, but the only way to improve in the latter is to practice it.
Immediate Evaluation
Participants' Written Comments Regarding the Program (Continued)

I believe that the course was beneficial, particularly in getting to know others in the organization that I do not usually come in contact with. I also gained an insight into communications and supervision that I did not have before the course. The weakest part seemed to be the time lost on certain points of low value, e.g., what is the value of someone reporting on an article that you also have read? What is the value of making extensive laundry lists on case studies when there may not be enough time left to cover even two or three points. Role playing could have been handled better. I would also like to see Bill Bright work in a formal presentation or two—possibly at the end.

I was somewhat at a loss as to why I was included in the group. However, I anticipate that the benefits of the course will be useful to me in future assignments. The theories recalled and the general subject matter of the course, while not new, were set forth in a useful and logical manner. Review of the notebook material at various times in the future should be most beneficial.

There is much value in this course; it gave me an awareness of people and things that I had not considered before. Bringing together people of diverse backgrounds to exchange thoughts and ideas was most interesting. I am particularly gratified that the Pure Oil Company has the foresight and interest in their people to provide the time, money and effort required to offer such an enjoyable and rewarding experience.

I felt the time was very productive and will be of good use to me directly and to the Company indirectly. I would like to see this study and training expanded to future seminars.

I feel that this type of course is very useful and have begun applying principles used here in associations with subordinates and in dealing with other supervisors—finding it helpful. The principles are not necessarily new, but their use can make life and the job easier and more enjoyable since they can avoid misunderstandings that people might make of what I might normally say or do.

More emphasis should be placed upon the practical rather than theoretical phases of "communication" since this is one of the basic problems in industry today. In general, I felt the course was very beneficial and provided some new ideas which will be explored in the course of my job.
Immediate Evaluation
Participants' Written Comments Regarding the Program (Continued)

I believe that the subject matter should be changed to cover less theory but more practical things. A discussion of a particular case should be concluded with a comparison between the group's answer to the problem or problems of the case and the solution of a person or persons who are skilled in the handling of such problems.

I think that the discussions were too free, i.e., if the discussion became circular it was allowed to go round and round. I enjoyed the theory but thought much of it emphasized ideal and extremely limited conditions.

I enjoyed the course very much. I thought it was well conducted and so far has been very helpful. Personally, I feel this type of course would be very helpful to line supervision.

The seminar was well conducted by Bill Bright. The course provides an excellent insight into the problem of communicating with your fellow man. I would like to know some of the solutions that were made in the case studies we had. I felt that something was missing without this answer.

Basically this was a good program but, in my opinion, the following might add to its value: 1) the program should be one continuous session lasting five days, eight hours per day, instead of drawn out over such a long period of time; 2) the meetings should be at a location apart from the office; and 3) the vacuum theory of leadership was over-used. If direct and strong leadership was not needed, then we might just as well have met in groups at coffee breaks and during lunch periods for our "bull" sessions.
EXHIBIT #3
EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
EVALUATION FORM

Name of Course (or Project) Seminar On Organizational Relations
(3-month delayed evaluation) (1-3)

Number of Meetings (or Separate Units) 8 Fridays (half-days)

Date Begun May 10, 1963  Date Ended June 28, 1963

Location(s) Where you Participated Palatine, Illinois (4-7)

Instructor(s) (or Leaders) W. E. Bright, Jr.

NOTE: Opinions of emphasis indicated by →
Strongest opinion in each segment is underlined.

I. Personally I feel this course should be described as follows:

→ (8) 10  It has helped me greatly in my present job.
→ (9) 13  It might help me in a future job.
→ (10) 11  It was indirectly beneficial.
(11)  3  It was interesting but of no special help to me.
(12)  1  It was often boring but I did learn something.
(13)    It was both boring and pointless.

II. In my opinion this course should be made available to:

(14)  1  All employees.
→ (15)  9  Selected employees.
→ (16) 11  All supervisors.
(17)  4  Selected supervisors.
→ (18)  7  All managers.
(19)  1  Selected managers.
(20)  4  A few carefully selected managerial prospects.
(21)    No one.
III. The kind of development/training represented by this course should be scheduled:

- (22) 17 On Company time.
- (23) 2 Half on Company time, half on personal time.
- (24) 2 Entirely after working hours.

IV. In my judgement the money and effort required to make this course available are:

- (25) 19 A sound investment.
- (26) 2 A risky investment.
- (27) A very poor investment.

V. I liked the following parts of the course:

- (28) 18 Subject matter.
- (29) 13 Methods of instruction.
- (30) 10 Resource or reference materials.
- (31) 5 Demonstrations.
- (32) 10 Case study discussions.
- (33) 4 Role playing.
- (34) 7 Lectures.
- (35) 2 Visuals.
- (36) 13 Meeting room facilities.
- (37) 11 Hour at which meetings were held.
- (38) 18 Make-up of group attending.
- (39) 20 Opportunity to share ideas with other participants.
- (40) 16 Skill of instructor(s).
VI. I did not like the following parts of the course:

(41) 1 Subject matter.
(42) 1 Methods of instruction.
(43) Resource or reference materials.
(44) Demonstrations.
(45) 6 Case study discussions.
(46) 15 Role playing.
(47) Lectures.
(48) Visuals.
(49) 1 Meeting room facilities.
(50) Hour at which meetings were held.
(51) Make-up of group attending.
(52) Skill of instructor(s).

VII. The following changes should be made in this course:

(53) 5 None; I like the course as it was.
(54) 2 It should be longer.
(55) 2 It should be shorter.
(56) 10 It should be more practical.
(57) It should emphasize theory more.
(58) 4 It should be redesigned to change emphasis on subjects covered.
(59) 3 There should be more discussion.
(60) 2 There should be less discussion.
(61) 6 The discussion should be devoted to more appropriate subjects.

VIII. On the basis of its value to me in my work (and in comparison with similar courses I have attended) this course (or project) should receive the following rating:

(62) 3 The best such course I have attended.
(63) 12 Among the better courses attended.
(64) 3 Average among such courses.
(65) Below average.
(66) Among the poorer courses attended.
(67) The worst such course ever attended.
EXHIBIT #4

3-MONTH DELAYED EVALUATION
SEMINAR ON ORGANIZATIONAL RELATIONS

May 10 through June 28, 1963

Participants' Written Comments Regarding the Program

I found the course very interesting and stimulating. At certain points, especially in case studies, I felt that a solution should have been given by the instructor to see if the solution arrived at by the participants would be similar or the same. On the second thought I realized (from previous emphasis) that there is no definite solution to any problem. Each one of us must find the best method for solving a problem. I feel that more could be benefited from the role playing if the roles were assigned in advance for the next session instead of assigning them as the course progressed. I am grateful for the experience it gave me. I am sure the course will be very beneficial in my future dealings with individual employees or a group of them. I feel certain that this course is very beneficial to a newly promoted supervisor who has had very little experience in dealing with employee problems.

I personally appreciated the course for three major reasons: 1) It allowed me to meet and get to know better a group of fellow employees I might otherwise not have known. Their opinions and comments were quite enlightening. 2) The course drove home several valuable points which I now use in my relations with others. 3) The course was a renewed demonstration of the interest the company has in its employees—particularly me. This was duly noted and appreciated. Like most any course of study, some alteration in the relative amounts of each topic discussed could be made. Some topics were better presented than others. I am sure you are aware of these minor points so I will not again elaborate on them.

I certainly consider the course to be of benefit since I now often find myself applying some of its basic thoughts—particularly in the area of active listening. If anything, I would suggest it be expanded to include more problems pertinent to the oil industry. I feel very strongly that this is a worthwhile investment on the part of the company.
There seemed to be complete freedom in expression of individuals' thoughts which I felt was exceptionally good. I was particularly interested in those areas where my opinions and beliefs were not shared by most of the group and also where there were one or two who had divergent opinions in relation to the group. Much of the case study involved blue collar workers and factory situations. Whether these are as helpful as cases closer to home may be a debatable issue, but I feel that the latter would be more helpful to individuals in our situation.

Briefly my reactions to the course are: 1) The course gave me a taste of knowledge of myself and of others for which I now want to know more. 2) I became well aware of my own failures and at least now have an insight as to how to correct them. 3) It is gratifying to learn that others are self-conscious, falter in their speech, do not say what they mean at all times, and you are not alone in the boat. 4) I did learn how to listen and not to prejudge and I carry with me an ever growing awareness of this in myself and look for it in others. 5) I wish time would permit further study along the same lines.

I enjoyed the course. It was very interesting and the informal atmosphere presented a good opportunity to become better acquainted with other people in our Company. However, it appeared to me that the course was pitched on too much of a theoretical plane; also that the reading matter was selected with the intent of "proving" the infallibility of the theories or techniques expounded. While I enjoyed the course, in all sincerity I cannot see how The Pure Oil Company will stand to profit from the twenty hours of job time I spent on it. For this reason I feel that the course time should be divided equally between Company and personal time.

While the course did not help me greatly in my present job, I believe it was of some immediate help and will possibly be of much greater help in the future. There was too much discussion of some of the case studies and the case study discussions should be ended by telling the group how an "expert" would have solved the problem instead of merely letting the group wonder if they reached the right conclusion.

I feel that some of the subject matter was extraneous and provided some rather dull discussions. If these subjects were taken out and replaced with a more active type of matter, I feel sure that an outstanding course would be provided.
In some instances discussions should have been guided more carefully so that the ultimate goal was kept aligned. I feel that attending the course has made me more sympathetic to the problems of others in communicating with me, and hopefully it has reduced problems in their understanding me and my actions. I feel the time was well spent.

Much of the time spent on case studies might have been more beneficial if conclusions could have been resolved. I also felt that the reference reading could have been more on the practical than theoretical side--which it did toward the end of the course.

I liked the opportunity of meeting other men in parts of the Company with which I have no opportunity for contact. It is difficult to say that any specific thing was learned, but no doubt the exposure to ideas has added to the background of knowledge on which discussions are based.

We should practice what we learn.

The course was very helpful to me. Since the completion of it situations have occurred in which I recalled our discussions covering similar instances in the case studies. I feel this alone was helpful to me in arriving at more sound decisions.

I believe greater benefits could have been derived had Mr. Bright imparted more of his knowledge and skills in lecture form. Summing up, I believe the course has helped me in dealing with certain types of individuals, and I certainly believe I could use other courses of this type to advantage.

The value of a seminar such as this was the discussions of the subject matter which depends a great deal upon the skill of the instructor to guide and the "make-up" of the group attending. I feel that this was a most interesting and beneficial seminar.

I feel the course was worthwhile because of its lasting impressions. I find myself now attempting to make an analysis of situations to determine whether there are factors involved which do not seem to be apparent on the surface of the situation.
I would recommend efforts be made to develop a more efficient group participation device than is provided by the case study and role playing approaches. Both of these techniques permit a passive attitude by a fair percentage of the group.

Certain materials utilized in the course came in very handy at a subsequent seminar. Because of the greater exposure, the various communication theories took on more significance. As mentioned previously, the immediate use of the seminar is limited, but should stand me in good stead at some future date.
COMBINED SUMMARY

Immediate and 3-Month Delayed Evaluations of Seminar On Organizational Relations
(May 10 thru June 28, 1963)

I. Personally I feel this course should be described as follows:

Note the increase in mentions from 6 to 10 for "It has helped me greatly in my present job" in the Delayed Evaluation. Throughout this item the opinion appears to have improved with time.

II. In my opinion this course should be made available to:

Again a significant improvement has occurred with time.

III. The kind of development/training represented by this course should be scheduled:

After 90 days two more attendees feel the course should be presented on Company time.

IV. In my judgment the money and effort required to make this course available are:

Three more persons felt the course was "a sound investment" after 90 days.

V. I liked the following parts of the course:

This group was even more of a cross section sample of the organization than is usual in such a seminar. Perhaps as a result the members emphasized what they learned from each other in both evaluations. Their appreciation of subject matter, however, increased with time.
VI. I did not like the following parts of the course:

As the group's liking for the subject matter increased, so also did its distaste for role playing—an instruction method used in just one of the eight meetings that made up the course. Similar evidence is beginning to suggest that role playing must be allotted more time than this in order to be appreciated. An interesting distaste for case study discussion seems also to have developed with time. This may actually be a reversion to a prior opinion rather than a new development.

VII. The following changes should be made in this course:

No significant change. Even more than most groups this one tended to resist concepts that appeared to be new or strange to them. The "more practical" comment in this context, of course, usually indicates disagreement with concepts or methods encountered.

VIII. On the basis of its value to me in my work (and in comparison with similar courses I have attended) this course (or project) should receive the following rating:

Initial enthusiasms tend to dissipate with time. The "among the better" rating in the delayed evaluation is probably the more accurate finding. A couple of "best" ratings were simply dropped out of the delayed tally because footnotes indicated this was the only such course attended.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Preston, George H. *Psychiatry for the Curious*. Farrar, 1940.


Whitehead, Alfred N. Aims of Education. Williams and Norgate, 1936.


Journals


Coffey, E. P. "Is Conference Method Your Method"? Training and Development Journal, (February, 1964), 36-84. (Conference method a real hope in training on organizational problems, but some conference leaders are weak in its use.)

Doe, J. P. "Communications Training," Training and Development Journal, (January, 1965), 28-30. (A course at Glidden Company for supervisory personnel in inter-personal communications; reported and evaluated Haney Text. Evaluation results: Mixed; not statistically significant, but test administrators were still convinced training did do some good.)
Fox, W. M. "A Measure of the Effectiveness of the Case Method in Teaching Human Relations," Personnel Administration, (July-August, 1963), 53-7. (University of Washington questionnaire results for student reactions to case method in management development.)


Miner, J. B. "Evidence Re Value of a Management Course Based on Behavioral Science Subject Matter," Journal of Business, (July, 1963), 325-35. (Evaluation of management course at University of Oregon (three terms) to determine if curriculum could influence managerial success.)

Moore, R. V. "Meet the Author: Executive Training at Johnson and Johnson Takes a New Twist," Personnel Journal, (March-April, 1966), 46-50. (Leading authors of recent books in management and related fields meet with managers to discuss their books and answer questions regarding underlying ideas of them.)

Piechula, J. R. "Method Improvement and Personnel Development," Training and Development Journal, (November, 1964), 47-51. (A "better methods" thirty-hour program at Schlitz Brewing Company is described.)

Rohan, T. M. "Management Crisis Eased Through Sound Training Program" (at Armco Steel), Iron Age, (July 16, 1962), 192: 70-2. (Lewis Allen approach on principles of management.)

Toussaint, M. N. and F. C. Munson. "How Not to Conduct a Management Training Program," Personnel Administration, (September-October, 1963), 12-20. (Experiences of authors in conducting various management training programs.)


White, J. C. "Improving Supervisory Judgment through Training," Personnel Journal, (December, 1963), 570-72. (Proved through showing before and after results of testing on a specimen program.) (National Bank of Commerce in New Orleans.) (Findings: positive.)

Winn, A. "Laboratory Training in Industry," Personnel Administration, (May-June, 1964), 6-104. (Discusses the values in T-Group (sensitivity) training on a vertical or "family" basis.)

Manuals

Fundamentals of Supervision. General Motors Institute. Eight sessions. Copyright 1940, Flint, Michigan. (Covers: organization, responsibilities, policy and procedures, planning, obtaining cooperation, getting ideas across, training subjects.)